

# The American Catholic Sociological Review

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Towards A Juridical Order..... <i>Leo J. Robinson, S.J.</i>	3
What America Is Doing to Accommodate Displaced Persons..... <i>Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M.</i>	9
On Defining Sociology ..... <i>Paul Hanly Furfey</i>	19
The Relation of Financial Assessment to Status in a Rural Parish.... <i>C. J. Nuesse</i>	26
The Sociology of Jose Medina Echavarria ..... <i>Stuart A. Queen</i>	39
Notes of Sociological Interest: March 26, 1948: Ten Years Old.....	46
News of Sociological Interest .....	47
Book Reviews: .....	49
Book Reviews:	
<i>An Introductory Study of the Family; The Contemporary American Family; Marriage and the Family; The Family in American Culture; Understanding Society; Sociology of Film; The School in American Social Order; Educational Sociology; The American Farmer; Workman's Compensation Insurance; Fundamentals of Labor Economics; Principles and Practice of Social Work; Unto the Least of These; Readings in Social Psychology; Hawaiian Americans; An Approach to Social Medicine; Short Notices</i>	
Periodical Reviews .....	69

MARCH 1948

---

**The Committee on Academic Sociology**  
of the  
**American Catholic Sociological Society**

invites members interested in an

**Institute on the Undergraduate  
Curriculum in Sociology**

to be held at Loyola University,  
820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Ill.

The purpose of the Institute will be to discuss plans for improving the college curriculum in sociology in preparation for post-college work in sociology and social work.

The sessions will be held from Monday through Saturday, June 14 through 19th, 1948. There will be no charge for the Institute.

Registration is limited. Applications and of inquiry should be addressed to

SISTER MARY LIGUORI, B.V.M.

Mundelein College  
CHICAGO 40, ILLINOIS

---



ual  
dge

Vo

C

To

W

On

Th

Th

No

Ne

Bo

Bo

Pe

Cu  
ar  
bo



Sociology Dept.  
Edget 15.

# The American Catholic Sociological Review

---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Towards A Juridical Order.....	3
<i>Leo J. Robinson, S.J.</i>	
What America Is Doing to Accommodate Displaced Persons.....	9
<i>Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M.</i>	
On Defining Sociology .....	19
<i>Paul Hanly Furfey</i>	
The Relation of Financial Assessment to Status in a Rural Parish....	26
<i>C. J. Nuesse</i>	
The Sociology of Jose Medina Echavarria .....	39
<i>Stuart A. Queen</i>	
Notes of Sociological Interest: March 26, 1948: Ten Years Old.....	46
News of Sociological Interest .....	47
Book Reviews: .....	49
Book Reviews:	
<i>An Introductory Study of the Family; The Contemporary American Family; Marriage and the Family; The Family in American Culture; Understanding Society; Sociology of Film; The School in American Social Order; Educational Sociology; The American Farmer; Workman's Compensation Insurance; Fundamentals of Labor Economics; Principles and Practice of Social Work; Unto the Least of These; Readings in Social Psychology; Hawaiian Americans; An Approach to Social Medicine; Short Notices</i>	
Periodical Reviews .....	69

---

Current and back issues of **The American Catholic Sociological Review** are indexed in the **Catholic Periodical Index**. The index to each volume is bound in with the December (No. 4) issue of each volume.

# The American Catholic Sociological Review

Official Publication of the AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

## EDITORIAL BOARD

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., Chairman</b><br>Loyola University, Chicago, Ill. | <b>Franz H. Mueller</b><br>College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.          |
| <b>A. H. Clemens</b><br>Catholic University<br>Washington 17, D. C.           | <b>Raymond W. Murray, S.C.</b><br>University of Notre Dame, Indiana        |
| <b>Francis J. Friedel, S.M.</b><br>Trinity College, Sioux City, Iowa          | <b>Eva J. Ross</b><br>Trinity College, Washington, D. C.                   |
| <b>Paul Hanly Furfey</b><br>Catholic University<br>Washington 17, D. C.       | <b>Louis A. Ryan, O.P.</b><br>Trinity College<br>Washington, D. C.         |
| <b>John Coogan, S.J.</b><br>University of Detroit, Detroit, Mich.             | <b>Gerald J. Schnepf, S.M.</b><br>McBride High School, St. Louis, Mo.      |
| <b>Edward A. Marciniak</b><br>Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.                | <b>Mary Elizabeth Walsh</b><br>Catholic University<br>Washington 17, D. C. |
| <b>N. S. Timasheff, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.</b>                   |  |

## BOOK REVIEW EDITOR

Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, Washington 17, D. C.

## DIRECTOR OF ACSS RESEARCH CENSUS

Clement S. Mihanovich, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

• • •

**Editorial and Business Offices:** Loyola University, 820 N. Michigan Ave., Chicago 11, Ill. All business and editorial communications should be sent to Rev. Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., at this address.

Address all communications concerning book reviews to Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, Washington 17, D.C.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW is published quarterly, during the months of March, June, October, and December. Annual membership dues are \$5.00 for constituent (personal) and \$5.00 for institutional members; the annual dues include a subscription to the REVIEW. The subscription rate for non-members is \$3.00 a year. Foreign subscriptions are \$3.25. Single copies of the REVIEW are \$0.75. Make all checks payable to the American Catholic Sociological Society.

Contents Copyrighted, 1948

• • •

## THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

### OFFICERS FOR 1948

- Honorary President:** Most Rev. Edwin V. O'Hara, Kansas City, Mo.  
**President:** Franz Mueller, College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minn.  
**1st Vice-President:** Clement S. Mihanovich, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.  
**2nd Vice-President:** Sister Mary Edward, S.S.J., College of St. Catherine, St. Paul, Minn.  
**Executive-Secretary:** Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., Loyola University, Chicago 11, Ill.  
**Members of the Executive-Council:** Edward A. Huth, University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio; Ernest Kilzer, O.S.B., St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.; Sister M. Liguori, B.V.M., Mundelein College, Chicago, Ill.; George McKenna, Jr. Xavier University, New Orleans, La.; C. J. Nuesse, Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.; Leo J. Robinson, S. J., Portland 9, Oregon; Eva J. Ross, Trinity College, Washington 17, D. C.

## Towards A Juridical Order\*

Leo J. Robinson, S. J.

THE MOST URGENT task confronting the Catholic sociologist in this period of rapid social change is that of providing not only for the harnessing of social power but also for the directing of it into channels constructed by social justice through individual and collective effort and government action. The appeal to Catholic sociologists is particularly in order today, for only those with a social philosophy distinguished by a value system which embraces both the natural and the supernatural are adequately equipped to accept the challenge of contemporary society and to translate into concrete realities the consequences of this social philosophy.

Pope Pius XII is my authority for appealing to Catholic students of society in respect to the need of building a juridical order. In his Christmas message of 1942, the Pontiff said, "That social life such as God willed it may attain its scope, it needs a juridical order to support it from without, to defend and protect it."

The obvious reasons for remarks of this tone from the Holy Father are, of course, the tragic conditions still existing in Europe where human rights and state duties are ignored or deformed to the extent that they are no longer recognizable. Fortunately, the heritage of common sense and Christian civilization has not been squandered in this country to the point where our social order no longer bears the imprint of its Godly origin. None of us is so naive, however, as to think that the juridical order here conforms adequately to the requirements of our social philosophy.

What is this juridical order to which Pope Pius XII has made such frequent reference? To put it very simply—a juridical order exists when the social order willed by God is incorporated into the law of the land. The juridical order is that aspect of the social order maintained by positive laws which define the rights and obligations of individuals and groups. It is the harmonious arrangement of the elements of society—the result of the influence of written, and even unwritten, law upon the behavior of its members. The juridical order is the legal and judicial framework within which the members of society and society itself achieve their end.

The idea of juridical order includes these three elements: *first*, rights and duties as required by justice; *secondly*, an enlightened social conscience

\*Presidential address given before the ninth annual convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society in St. Louis, Missouri, January 31, 1948.

541500

on those rights and duties; *thirdly*, their incorporation into the law of the land. For example:

(1) Everyone has a God-given right to housing conditions required for decent living;

(2) All in society, especially the voters, politicians, and the politically influential, should be fully informed of this truth and the social facts existing in their community;

(3) This enlightened public opinion should be incorporated into a state law abolishing inhuman slums and sub-standard living conditions existing in too many of our cities. And in their place must be established homes consonant with human dignity.

Like his predecessor, the present Pope is eager to see that the demands of social justice are satisfied: "The relations," he writes, "of man to man, of the individual to society, to authority, to civil duties; the relations of society and of authority to the individual should be put on a firm juridic footing and be guarded, when the need arises, by the authority of the courts." That is to say, the actual relationships of man to man, of man to society, and of societies between themselves, must be brought into agreement with the requirements of social justice, must be reinforced by law, and must receive the support of an enlightened judiciary.

There is nothing new in this as far as our social philosophy is concerned. But the fact that the Pontiff sees fit to insist upon this point is indicative that a juridical order is still wanting. The sociologist, in proposing solutions to problems, should not hesitate, then, to invoke the authority of the state. Multiplication of laws is not *per se* an evil, and in a complex society laws are required. In fact, it may be laid down as a sociological principle that laws increase in direct proportion to the complexity of society. To hold, as some do, that the state with the least laws is the best governed, is to maintain, logically, that anarchy is the ideal. We are looking forward hopefully to an era when the laws governing society will conform to the ideal, and to hasten the inaugural of such an order, we should not hesitate to enlist the power of the state. This is far from advocating *statism*. For due regard must be had for the principle of subsidiarity which provides that where private initiative suffices, the state may not arbitrarily assume the functions of the subsidiary groups.

Lest we remain in ignorance with respect to the rights that the Pope desires protected within the framework of a juridical order, in that same Christmas message Pope Pius XII lists a catalogue of these rights—rights which need the strong support of social justice, and which should be protected by the law of the state. They are, according to the Pontiff, "the right to maintain and develop one's corporal, intellectual, and moral life, and especially the right to religious formation and education; the right to worship God in private and public and to carry on religious works of

chari  
right  
right  
sable  
choic  
life;  
and  
the E  
called  
ophel  
by th  
shapi  
social  
Howe  
legisl  
Never  
the s  
confo  
It is  
in ou  
social  
school  
Hous  
had  
into  
being  
steril  
They  
we le  
invol  
perso  
voted  
legisl  
sourc  
in F  
Popu  
and  
of th

charity; the right to marry and to achieve the end of married life; the right to conjugal and domestic society; the right to work as an indispensable means towards the maintenance of family life; the right to free choice of a state of life; and hence, too, of the priesthood or religious life; the right to the use of material goods in keeping with one's duties and social limitations." These rights are certainly ignored by forces from the East now threatening Western Europe, and they are ignored or seriously called into question by a goodly number of sociologists, political philosophers, and social reformers here in the United States—called in question by those who are moulding the public opinion of tomorrow, who are shaping the laws for things to come.

Not only should there be a clear delineation of the provisions of social justice, but also these requirements must be embodied into law. However, by legal embodiment we refer not merely to the work of the legislature. It must be borne in mind that morality cannot be legislated. Nevertheless the work of the legislature is necessary because the power of the state is thus enlisted in making a moral order—a juridical order in conformity with the dictates of Christian social philosophy—more feasible. It is extremely unfortunate that so many of our own Catholic products in our state and federal legislative bodies have such meager knowledge of sociology and such hazy ideas regarding social philosophy.

A young Catholic lawyer, a graduate of a Jesuit college and a law school conducted under their supervision, was once the speaker of the House of Representatives in one of our western states. In that position he had more than ordinary control over the legislation that was being made into law. Every day his teachers received copies of the bills that were being proposed. One day we found a bill that provided for the wholesale sterilization of the feeble-minded. Efforts were made to stop the bill. They were unsuccessful. But in the course of talking with the young man we learned that he had never received instructions in the moral principles involved. He neither knew what sterilization was or what feeble-minded persons were—nor did the other Catholics in the House. Some of them voted for the bill. God speed the day when our Catholic members of our legislatures are Catholic in thought as well as in name.

No doubt you have heard of the *Action Populaire* in Paris. It is a source of Catholic social information that has exercised great influence in France. The Fathers there told me that if there had been no *Action Populaire* twenty-five years ago, there would be no George Bidault today.

Laws are not enough. People must want them! The social scientist and reformer, Frederic Le Play, indicated the futility for social reform of the majority of the laws enacted in France following the revolution

of 1789. They were sterile in effect, he claimed, because they were unaccompanied by a change in outlook and habits of the ruling class. Laws are not enough.

An important element of a sound juridical order is the existence of an enlightened social conscience and a responsible public opinion. By the former we simply mean a widespread ethical conviction of the need of certain legal measures. In a sense we do have the kind of laws we want. Once there exists in the popular mind a realization of need, once there is created a deep ethical conviction, responsible public opinion will inevitably follow. Without the former—an enlightened social conscience—law enforcement will be extremely difficult. There must be the perception of the moral necessity of the legislation, else evasion will be the order of the day. The prohibition amendment and the NIRA were good examples of this. Without the latter—a responsible public opinion—legislators will react for the most part to the pressure of special interests—supposed “popular sentiment” as Pius XII calls it.

As an example of popular pressure we have right now the “mercy killing” legislation proposed for the state of New York and bearing the approval of one thousand physicians of that state. Only an enlightened social conscience and an aroused public opinion that is responsible can stay this type of legislation which assuredly is “harmful to the liberty, property, honor, or health of the individuals.”

The Catholic sociologist is confronted with tremendous opportunities here in the United States. His is a manifold service. There is his work as a scientific investigator, educator, and, above all, there is his work as a social philosopher.

In our role as social philosophers we must carefully study the actual character, and often, too, the changing nature of social relationships. A realistic grasp of any social situation will, moreover, enable the social philosopher to determine what shall be done about it. Effective action will hardly ever result unless there be supporting social legislation.

Take the role of the woman in modern society. Women can hold 80 per cent of the jobs now held by men. The Leonine theory of a living wage took into consideration the contribution of the wife, and in an economy characterized by more simple living, her condition was considerable. In our modern industrial society, with its extremely competitive atmosphere, it is open to question whether or not one working man in a family can bring home enough to maintain the standard of living we have grown to associate with American society. We may find it necessary to change our concept of a reasonable and frugal wage. We may find it necessary to re-assess the role of the workman in our industrial society. We cannot

sit ba  
and fo  
society.  
The P  
contro  
indica  
Laws  
the sh  
role o  
social  
feasib  
wives  
family  
a soci  
day li  
pealin  
philos

T  
unders  
For to  
almost  
investi  
perly  
data c  
of inc  
greate  
United  
tions.  
ed the  
bargai  
comes  
shoul  
the ac  
bargai  
interp  
to wh  
labor  
His d  
XII c  
norms  
“ordin

sit back and merely quote the definition of Leo XIII of a family wage and feel as if we have made our contribution. Look at facts. As economic society is constituted today, women must work. Mothers, wives must work. The present arrangement encourages the grossest immorality. The birth control industry is a billion dollar business. And reputable statistics indicate that there is one abortion for every 2.5 live births in our cities. Laws to protect the family and the home must reach out into the factory, the shop, the office. Frankly, the chary manner in which we approach the role of government in this matter makes the common man wonder if our social philosophy is realistic—if our plan of social reconstruction is feasible. Either we must advocate legislation that will protect mothers and wives in their jobs or we must campaign for legislation that will provide family allotments. Higher wages will not solve the problem. We preach a social philosophy that is as lofty as it is difficult to achieve in every day life, but we could make our plan of social reconstruction more appealing if we were more forthright in the application of our social philosophy.

The Catholic social scientist must devote more intensive study to the understanding of that latest branch of his discipline—Industrial Sociology. For too long a time the economist has had the field of capital and labor almost entirely to himself. At long last, the sociologist has entered on the investigation of a field of inter-human relationships which are most properly his concern. The social scientist is qualified as no other to gather data on the distinctively human relationships of workers to unions and of individual employers to their associations, and what is perhaps of the greatest significance for the stability of the whole social economy of the United States, on the many complex features of management-labor relations. We have passed the day when the policy of "might is right" governed these relationships. But we still leave far too much to across-the-board bargaining where, in the last analysis, the party with the greatest power comes off the winner. As a social philosopher, the Catholic social scientist should be able to do more than catalogue societal phenomena present in the activities of industrial society, e.g., the organization of unions, collective bargaining, arbitration, mediation, strikes, occupational society. He must interpret their socio-ethical roles. He must be able to discern where and to what extent legislative action should be employed. For example, should labor courts be provided to solve the problems of collective bargaining? His duty it is to provide the public-policy makers with what Pope Pius XII calls "a clearly formulated and defined right" or "clear judicial norms." He will work for laws which in reality as well as in name are "ordinances of reason" and not the product of positivistic sociologists



and jurists who would have law a blind impulse of the will.

A national FEPC as well as state FEPC legislation doubtless meets the approval of all of us. Our social philosophy calls for such equality; the conditions prevalent in practically every state clamor for such corrective legislation but evidently there is not an aroused, enlightened public opinion. A crusading — crusading in the best sense — spirit, the outgrowth of our social philosophy, should make each one of us a zealous agitator for remedial legislation along this line. Surely, here to invoke the legislative branch of the state is merely to implement man's right to employment.

Social security, in an ideal society, would be the result of the proper functioning of subsidiary groups. We do not live in an ideal society, and while we are struggling for an approximation of such a society, people must be secure, not only in their old age, not only with respect to work, but also with respect to health. If private initiative is incapable of providing or does not provide security in health to all, we have a right to call upon the state, and the state has the duty to provide.

A cursory over-view of the implications of a juridical order consonant with the social philosophy we avow would protract this paper unduly. What I have said is suggestive. We must be bolder and more courageous in our effort to bring about a reconstructed social order. The appeal is made not only to you as social scientists but also as social philosophers. We distinguish the roles but do not divorce them. Inter-human relationships are the fabric of sociology, but inter-human relationships have responsible agents as terms. We judge, therefore, that sociology embraces not merely social science but social philosophy. We look for division of labor at times, but never a division of minds.

Make no mistake, government is getting bigger, its role is increasingly more enveloping, perhaps necessarily so. For the policy maker who is the true politician there must be at hand not only an analysis of present society but also the blue-print of the society we envision for the future. In the hands of muddled philosophers, positivistic sociologists and materialistic social reformers, a social fabric will be woven that will in very truth be a caricature of what should be. In the hands of politicians, social reformers and sociologists trained in the school of a social discipline wedded to an acceptance and appreciation of the essential verities of human life and destiny, we can hope that a juridical order will emerge—a juridical order in which the responsibilities of the state will be fully realized. Towards the realization of that order we must tend.

*Portland 9, Oregon.*



## What America Is Doing To Accommodate Displaced Persons

GERALD J. SCHNEPP, S. M.

**W**HAT AMERICA is doing to accommodate displaced persons may be discussed by considering first, what the government is doing, and second, by what private organizations are accomplishing to help resettle the estimated one million refugees in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

Our present quota laws permit the admission of only a small number of displaced persons. For example, the combined quotas of Poland, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are 8,107 persons per year, whereas it has been estimated that over 900,000 displaced persons are natives of these five countries.<sup>1</sup> Scarcely one in fifty of our "fair share" could come in this way.

Recognizing this difficulty, President Truman on Dec. 22, 1945, issued a directive urging the speeding up of the use of the central eastern European quotas. The result of this change of policy was that between May 20, 1946 and June 30, 1947 a total of 19,752 displaced persons from over 31 European countries were admitted.<sup>2</sup> Thus it can be seen that the Truman directive has not added any very significant number to the total displaced persons who can come to the United States under our present laws.

Another difficulty is section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 which excludes "persons whose ticket or passage is paid by any corporation, association, society, municipality or foreign government, either directly or indirectly."<sup>3</sup> As interpreted now, if the money is advanced in the form of a loan from relatives or a welfare organization, the DP will not be excluded. This puts the burden on the voluntary agencies such as the N.C.W.C., Church World Service, United Service for New Americans and others who have been advancing these loans. The paradox is that money from the United States contributed to the International Refugee Organization

1 Quota figures from Maurice R. Davie, *What Shall We Do About Immigration?*, No. 115, (N.Y., Public Affairs Committee, Inc., 1946,) 10. Estimates of DP's from Walter Dushnyck and William J. Gibbons, S.J., *Refugees are People* (N.Y., America Press, July, 1947), 16-33.

2 *Displaced Persons and the International Refugee Organization*, Report of a special Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H.R.), U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947, 74. (Hereafter referred to as "Fulton Report.")

3 Cited in *Fulton Report*, 77.

may be used to transport these people to other countries but not to the United States.<sup>4</sup>

Another service our government is performing for displaced persons is the financial contribution of about \$70,000,000 a year to the Preparatory Commission of the International Refugee Organization. This amounts to 61 per cent of the actual approved budget under which PCIRO is operating. It is to be noted, however, that the bulk of the IRO budget, or about 80 per cent, is applied to care and maintenance in the camps, a tendency which will perpetuate the problem.<sup>5</sup> Apart from the fact that the organization is not receiving adequate help from the nations of the world, it labors under other difficulties. It is referred to in the so-called Fulton Report as "a temporary substitute for an impermanent agency,"<sup>6</sup> because, although it was set up as a planning body, it has been forced into the position of an operating agency. It has been obliged to organize quickly, picking up such personnel as it could from its defunct predecessor organizations, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees.

One of the recent ventures of the PCIRO is the survey of professional men and women under its care with the purpose of submitting their qualifications to governments and private organizations. This work was prompted largely by the survey of college professors in the camps made last summer under the auspices of War Relief Services—N.C.W.C. and described later in this paper. If public and private groups will advance the necessary fees and guarantee one year's maintenance the admission of DP's to the United States will be immeasurably speeded up if and when Congress passes the appropriate legislation.

Appropriate legislation to admit DP's comes under the head of unfinished business. The present status of the proposed legislation—the Stratton Bill in the House and the Ferguson Bill in the Senate—is favorable *if* political considerations do not dominate the final vote. After extensive hearings during the summer the House Judiciary Committee did not issue a recommendation.

In attempting to secure some authoritative statements on the chances of this legislation passing in the present session of Congress, we wrote to Senator Homer Ferguson (Rep., Mich.) who introduced S. 1563 and Representative William G. Stratton, (Rep., Ill.) who introduced H.R. 2910, popularly called the "Stratton Bill." Senator Ferguson answered as follows in a letter dated January 19:

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 11-17

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 14

I have been informed by the chairman of the Sub-Committee of the Committee on the Judiciary which now has the bill before it that the measure should be favorably reported to the Senate in the week of February 1. We are hopeful of early and favorable action by the Senate after its reporting and will press for its passage as soon as possible.

Representative Stratton wrote a lengthy statement in which he reviewed the background to date, and then had this to say, under date of January 24:

The future prospects for legislation of some sort favorable to the admission of displaced persons are good. It is quite widely believed that if the Stratton Bill could be gotten to the House floor it would stand a good chance of passage. The same thing is true of the Senate Bill. Signs are increasing that both major parties realize that they must take some action on these or compromise substitute bills.

The most serious danger at the moment is that compromises which actually cripple the project may be adopted. The best criterion for judging such substitute measures is to evaluate the extent of their departure from the principles of the Stratton Bill. If they reduce the numbers excessively, or insert detailed and difficult screening or selectivity provisions, it may be guessed that they are attempts to kill, not improve, the legislation first prepared.

I am sure, however, that a vigilant electorate can prevent sabotage of the strong movement to bring an end to the suffering of our most deserving allies. Watch your congressman.<sup>7</sup>

The individual states can be of assistance also. It would be well if the governor of each state would follow the lead taken in Minnesota, North Dakota, Iowa and a few others, where committees have been appointed to study the problem and prepare the way. For example, Governor Luther W. Youngdahl of Minnesota appointed such a committee on Nov. 10 and one of the results is that a census is being taken by 3,000 priests and ministers to discover Minnesotans who have relatives in DP camps. The committees in North Dakota and Iowa consist of representatives of church, labor, agricultural, and veterans' groups—a pattern that might well be followed elsewhere.<sup>8</sup>

Most significant on the state level is the meeting of governors called by Governor Youngdahl and to convene shortly. North Dakota, South Dakota, Missouri, Wisconsin, Nebraska, Iowa, Kansas and others have been invited for discussion and planning. These states have lost an aggregate of almost 800,000 population in the past six years; their ability to absorb a considerable number of displaced persons is evident. A year ago, the Maine

<sup>7</sup> Letters are in Author's possession.

<sup>8</sup> *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Dec. 24, 1947. See also *The Light*, No. 13, Dec. 1, 1947 (Official publication of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East 36th St., New York 16, N.Y.)

legislature passed a resolution inviting the Baltic peoples, numbering 82,000, to that state.<sup>9</sup> Other states which could particularly profit from the abilities of displaced persons are Montana, Wyoming, Colorado,<sup>10</sup> but every state could absorb some of them.

Turning now to a consideration of what private organizations are doing, let us discuss the work of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic agencies and include a word about the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons.

Unquestionably, the Jews are doing more than any other private group to assist displaced persons. In fact, one might say that they are doing more than public groups in resettlement work, because at Atlantic City in mid-December a budget of \$250,000,000 was approved for the 1948 United Jewish Appeal—a total more than twice that of the International Refugee Organization in Geneva. Of this amount, United Palestine Appeal received more than \$146,000,000 to provide for 75,000 immigrants to Palestine; the Joint Distribution Committee was authorized to spend over \$88,000,000 for displaced and needy Jews in Europe; and the United Service for New Americans was given \$13,664,000 to care for Jewish immigrants to the United States.<sup>11</sup>

One of the reasons Jews have accomplished more than other groups is that they were made keenly aware of the need shortly after Hitler came to power and so they have been working at this problem for fifteen years. Today there are about 750 representatives of Jewish agencies working in the DP camps.

Our interest here is in the work of the USNA, which has expanded its service until it is second in size only to the American Red Cross. In less than 1½ years, more than 30,000 Jews have entered this country, most of them destitute and in need of rehabilitation. Through the good offices of United Service for New Americans they are distributed in every state of the Union; 75 per cent are self-sustaining.<sup>12</sup> The Migration Department guides and assists persons residing in America in aiding friends and relatives to come here. Port and dock services include meeting the immigrants, taking them to the Reception Shelter, or routing them to transportation. The Shelter provides food, rooms, clothing, and medical care. Skilled, personalized service is given by the National Case Work Division

9 Hearings before Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization of the Committee of the Judiciary, House of Representatives, 80th Congress, first session, on H.R. 2910. (Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947), 479. (Hereafter referred to as "Hearings.")

10 Hearings, 495.

11 St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Dec. 15, 1947.

12 For these and other facts in this section, the writer is indebted to Facts and Figures on the Immigration and Adjustment of Refugee New-comers and the Program of United Service for New Americans. Mimeographed bulletin, USNA, 15 Park Row, New York 7, N.Y.

to r  
arr  
and  
men  
to t  
to c

New  
sion.  
Adj  
men  
fessi  
Inc.,  
Serv  
abro  
favo  
natio

com  
veys  
Pale  
adv  
is ty

Nati  
whic  
and

is c  
Con  
Cou

Prot  
a gr  
a m

13

to relieve the normal bewilderment, strain, and confusion arising from arrival in a foreign country. Reception centers are set up in New York and San Francisco. A basic principle followed by the National Resettlement Division of USNA is that "it is desirable both to the individual and to the country at large to make the widest distribution of newcomers to communities throughout the United States."

Bearing testimony to the thorough organization of United Service for New Americans are such other divisions as: a Religious Functionary Division, specializing in the reception of rabbis and students; a Vocational Adjustment Department, providing counseling, retraining, and job placement; a Business and Loan Services division, assisting business and professional men, workers and farmers; the European-Jewish Children's Aid, Inc., which supervises all Jewish children brought to this country; a Location Service which centralizes the finding of relatives in this country and abroad; and a Community Relations Department, which promotes conditions favorable to the integration of immigrants and carries on both local and national programs of interpretation.

Will the opening of Palestine greatly reduce the number of Jews coming to this country? The answer is uncertain. On the one hand, surveys made in the camps show that the large majority of Jews preferred Palestine if possible. The testimony of Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, former adviser to the Army, in his official report to Secretary Kenneth C. Royall, is typical:

It is my estimate that no more than about 60,000 of the Jewish D.P.'s wish to come to the United States, the balance desiring to go to Palestine... If the United States should liberalize its immigration laws, about 25 per cent of the Jewish D.P.'s would choose to come here and about 75 per cent would continue to prefer Palestine.<sup>13</sup>

On the other hand, this and other surveys were made before the United Nations' action opened Palestine, precipitating the rioting and bloodshed which have ensued. Also, the doors to the United States were closed—and still are—to all but a few.

Protestant efforts are largely centered in Church World Service, which is constituted by the Federal Council of Churches, the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, the American Committee for the World Council of Churches, and representatives of seventeen denominations.

In spite of the fact that only 14 per cent of the DP's are members of Protestant or Eastern Orthodox Churches, Church World Service has done a great deal. It has given aid to 1,488 persons arriving at the rate of 100 a month, and these people have been resettled in 32 states and in 124 com-

munities throughout the United States. Its current annual budget is about \$1,000,000. The organization is enlisting the active cooperation of the interdenominational Councils of Churches in 36 states and in 633 cities to help the DP's settle and become self-supporting. The regular staff of Church World Service, composed of trained social workers, will continue to organize community interest and resources seeking the cooperation of the Family Service Associations and other community service agencies such as the YMCA's and the YWCA's.<sup>14</sup> Specific goals for 1947 for all Church World Service assistance were, in finances, \$12,000,000; and in clothing, shoes, and bedding, 1,000,000 pounds per month.<sup>15</sup> The agency has 36 representatives in Europe.

At its meeting in Atlanta on January 13, the Federal Council of Churches adopted a statement saying:

In cooperation with the Roman Catholic and the Jewish agencies, Church World Service will assume its proper share of the responsibility for Displaced Persons coming to this country . . . When Congress acts [it] will be ready to carry through on a much larger scale what it has already demonstrated it is able to do under severe handicaps and restrictions. It now waits for Congressional action.<sup>16</sup>

Before taking up what Catholics are doing, mention must be made of the Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, a non-profit, non-denominational organization which has set as its objective the passage of the Stratton Bill. It has fostered the campaign in a vigorous and intelligent manner, through pamphlets, news releases, radio and other addresses, and its publication, *The Light*. It has promoted the organization of citizens' committees in many cities and has encouraged the states to plan for the reception of displaced persons when its goal is achieved. The fact that public opinion in this country is largely in favor of admission of these refugees must be attributed in great measure to its work.<sup>17</sup>

Since an estimated 65 per cent of the displaced persons are Catholics, the Church has been active in their behalf for some time. With the cessation of hostilities, War Relief Services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference took over the direction of activities for Catholic DP's. It centralized Catholic efforts and has furnished religious, educational, occupational, and recreational supplies to the camps; it has distributed some 370 tons of food and clothing with an estimated value of \$1,050,000;

14 Statement adopted by Federal Council of Churches, Atlanta, Ga., Jan. 13, 1948. Mimeographed copy. Also, letter from Miss Aroos Benneyan, Church World Service, 214 East 21st St., New York 10, N.Y., Jan. 14, 1948.

15 *You Can Work a Miracle of Healing*, Church World Service. It also lists the 17 denominations referred to above.

16 Statement of Federal Council of Churches, Jan. 13, 1948.

17 For further information address the Committee at 39 East 36th St., New York 16, N.Y.



it has maintained 50 representatives in Europe. The agency is operating four tuberculosis hospitals in Germany.<sup>18</sup>

WRS-NCWC, through the Catholic Committee for Refugees, has, during the past ten years handled a total of almost 13,000 cases of refugees from all over the world, more than one-third of them during the past fiscal year.<sup>19</sup> These figures indicate the increased tempo since the end of the war, but also the relatively small numbers which the agency was able to help, compared to the estimated 500,000 Catholic displaced persons.

The work of the Catholic Committee for Refugees is thorough. Transportation and fees are paid, relatives are notified, the refugees are met at the pier, and overnight lodging is provided at a 50-bed shelter or at small hotels. During the past year, 2,285 persons were brought to the United States, 1,285 of them by virtue of the committee's corporate affidavit. Similar to Jewish and Protestant experience, most of these newcomers are now self-sufficing and none has become a public charge. They have secured housing accommodations, in the main, from relatives and friends and are settled in 34 States, the District of Columbia and the Territory of Hawaii.

Another project undertaken by War Relief Services was the interviewing of 490 men and women in DP camps to discover those with particular academic qualifications. This was done by Rev. Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., professor of history at Fordham and editor of *Thought* and by Rev. Edward Rooney, S.J., Director General of the Jesuit Educational Association. Described in detail in *America*,<sup>20</sup> the project has since been summarized in a 33-page booklet which has been distributed to some 100 colleges. The 490 are listed by name, sex, age group, DP status, nationality, family status, major subjects, experience, religion (not all are Catholics), personality rating and ability to speak English. Colleges that wish to engage these people may secure more detailed information from War Relief Services. The offering of a one-year contract will fulfill the conditions for one year's maintenance. WRS will handle transportation and immigration details.<sup>21</sup> (I might note that there are ten sociologists in the list). As a result of this study, the IRO has undertaken a similar project but including technicians of all kinds. At latest report, the first edition of this catalogue

18 **Fulton Report**, 51. Also, letter from Msgr. Edward Swanstrom, WRS-NCWC.

19 Information in this and succeeding paragraph from Alphonse A. Dietsche, "Catholic Assistance to Displaced Persons," (NCWC release), *The Southern Messenger*, Jan. 8, 1948.

20 Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., "Ph. D.'s in the DP Camps," *America*, Vol. 78, No. 2, Oct. 11, 1947, 37-39.

21 Interview with Rev. Gerald G. Walsh, S.J., at WRS-NCWC, 350 Fifth Ave., New York 1, N. Y., Dec. 30, 1947.

is ready and lists some 40,000 DP's with technical skills.<sup>22</sup>

Most important, as well as most recent of the WRS-NCWC's undertakings is the organization of the National Catholic Resettlement Council on Dec. 12, 1947. The creation of the Council was preceded by a number of events, the first of which was the formation of the Vatican Migration Office last year, with the purpose of coordinating Catholic efforts for refugees throughout the world. As explained by Msgr. Walter S. Carroll, of the Papal Secretariat of State, the Vatican Migration Office does not undertake the actual work of resettlement, but appoints committees in the countries where refugees may find a new home.<sup>23</sup>

Following up the lead of the Vatican, a number of American organizations, notably the N.C.W.C., the National Conference of Catholic Charities, and the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, began to study the problem, to make surveys of possibilities here, and to organize Catholic opinion in favor of the admission of DP's. Most Rev. William T. Mulloy, D.D., Bishop of Covington and President of the NCRLC, presented seventeen favorable responses from as many bishops in his testimony at the hearings on the Stratton Bill.<sup>24</sup> Msgr. John O'Grady, speaking before the annual meeting of the NCCC last October, said:

Though our Church nationally will have a certain amount of funds available to support affidavits for those who cannot pay their own way, no national organization will have funds enough to sponsor all who should be admitted.<sup>25</sup>

Following this recognition that the problem called for unified national action, the Administrative Board of Catholic Bishops at their meeting in Washington in November, adopted a resolution approving the formation of a National Catholic Resettlement Council. After outlining the proposed organization, they concluded with the warning that unless this problem is solved within the next two years, "there will be disillusionment and bitterness" which may be directed toward the Catholic Church.<sup>26</sup>

Taking the initiative as directed by the Bishops, Msgr. Edward E. Swannstrom, executive director of War Relief Services, called a meeting of representatives of the interested groups—the Catholic Committee for Refugees, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the National Catholic Rural Life Conference, and groups representing Slovak, Ukrainian, Slovene, Croatian, Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, and Polish Catholics. At

22 New York Times, Jan. 4, 1948.

23 The Southern Messenger, Nov. 20, 1947.

24 Hearings, 195. Also, correspondence with Most Rev. William T. Mulloy, D.D.

25 St. Louis Register, Oct. 17, 1947.

26 Bishops' Statement, in office of WRS-NCWC, New York. Mimeographed.



this meeting Dec. 11-12, 1947, the National Catholic Resettlement Council was launched and the Bishops of 118 dioceses notified.

Each Bishop was asked to set up a Diocesan Resettlement Committee consisting of local representatives of the national organizations. It was suggested that the logical director would be the Director of Catholic Charities, and the associate director the Rural Life Director for the diocese. The Diocesan Committee will fulfill these functions: 1) Education: meetings should be held explaining the problem, to develop favorable attitudes and ultimately to influence Congressional action; 2) Securing opportunities for displaced persons by studying and reporting the employment needs of the community; 3) Financial sponsorship of one or more displaced persons. The Council admitted this was the most difficult function, but suggested that sponsorship could be in the form of loans repayable by the DP's. Relatives, wealthy Catholics, St. Vincent de Paul Conferences and other parish organizations, the parish as a whole—these are the possible sources. 4) Local groups should report their experiences to the national council which will make them available to groups throughout the country.<sup>27</sup>

Each parish is likewise encouraged to form a resettlement committee so that the full force of Catholic individuals and Catholic organizations—such as the National Council of Catholic Men, the National Council of Catholic Women, the St. Vincent de Paul Society, the Knights of Columbus, the Holy Name Society, the Daughters of Charity and many others—will be brought to bear on a solution of this problem.

Calling this "the greatest challenge ever made to the Catholic Church in the United States," the Council feels that the project is possible, but that the only way it can be done is on a diocesan and parish level.<sup>28</sup>

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Among the conclusions and recommendations that emerge from this study, the following seem most important:

1) The campaign to pass legislation to admit displaced persons is not over by any means. Everyone should do all in his power to urge Congress to fulfill the will of the people. Results of surveys on housing and employment possibilities should be ready for presentation at the Senate Hearings.

2) Congress should be urged to follow the recommendation of the Fulton Report and remove the restriction on the use of public funds for

27 Organization of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, in office of WRS-NCWC, New York. Mimeographed.

28 Ibid.

resettling DP's. If it fails to do so, plans should be made for a national fund-raising campaign. The staggering amount needed to implement the Bill once it is passed, will call for a vigorous national campaign. Perhaps Community Chests and Councils, through its affiliates, would undertake this task, since it has the experience and the machinery to do it well.

3) Experience of the private agencies shows that displaced persons are being settled in every state of the Union. Therefore, each state should form a Committee and study the further possibilities of resettlement within its borders. Cities should do the same.

4) The Jewish effort for DP's should be not only admired but also imitated. To emphasize the magnitude of the problem, perhaps it should be said that the Fulton report found even Jewish aid "meager in comparison to the needs of the group it serves."<sup>29</sup> In any case, Jewish experience in organizing and administering assistance will be valuable to the other organizations.

5) Specific recommendations for Catholics would be: a) Carry out without delay the Hierarchy's mandate in the creation of the National Catholic Resettlement Council by forming diocesan and parish committees for the study of the problem, financing the program, and for the reception of displaced persons when they arrive; b) For educational institutions, study the report of Fathers Walsh and Rooney and start in motion the machinery which will bring these persons with special academic attainments to this country; c) Continue the splendid support in food and clothing collections which have been of inestimable help to the persons in the camps, and, finally, d) Apply to ourselves the words of Pope Pius XII, in his address to a group of United States Senators:

The immigration problem today poses completely new questions... The force of circumstances may sometimes suggest restrictive legislation or relaxations in the application of such laws... Animated as you are by that spirit of compassion for the sufferings of mankind that is so characteristic of your people, you will seek—We are sure—the means to alleviate them.<sup>30</sup>

*St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.*

29 Fulton Report, 52-53 gives comparison of different religious efforts.

30 *New York Times*, Nov. 2, 1947.

TH  
pres  
of th  
orde  
gest

publ  
truly  
in w  
able  
direc  
book  
be l

turn  
on  
no  
com  
it w  
one  
call  
"In  
stud  
soci

1 Str  
p. 1  
bers  
of s  
is so  
tion  
as a  
Yor  
L. V  
A t  
the

## On Defining Sociology

PAUL HANLY FURFEY

THERE SEEMS to be a rather general impression that sociologists are unable to agree on a definition of their science. If this is true it is presumably a severe handicap to the progress of sociology. The object of the present paper is to examine published definitions of the science in order to determine areas of agreement and disagreement and then to suggest principles for eliminating whatever disagreement exists.

For the present purpose it is first necessary to have a sample of published definitions. There seems to be no feasible way of securing a truly random sample of all the definitions which have ever been proposed in writing. The universe to be sampled is nowhere listed in readily available form as, for example, the population of a city is listed in the city directory. Definitions are scattered throughout an enormous literature of books, pamphlets, dissertations, and periodicals, some of which could not be located without very great difficulty.

The writer therefore proceeded as follows. All definitions which turned up in two or three years of intermittent search were jotted down on slips of paper. Only formal definitions were considered; therefore no attempt was made to interpret the mind of those writers who did not commit themselves explicitly. No definition was eliminated because it was logically defective or because the writer disagreed with it. Only one type of definition was systematically excluded, the type which Dodd calls "operational" and which is illustrated by his own usage as follows: "In practice, the content of Sociology is operationally defined by the studies published by sociologists, such as the members of the national sociological associations."<sup>1</sup> Evidently this is not so much a definition as a

<sup>1</sup> Stuart Carter Dodd, *Dimensions of Society* (New York: Macmillan, 1942), p. 12. This is loosely worded, even from an operational standpoint. Membership in a national sociological association is not always a good criterion of sociological competence. Again, not everything written by a sociologist is sociology. Ward's books on paleobotany fall strictly under Dodd's definition. Sometimes authors of textbooks point to the content of their volumes as a definition of sociology. See, for example, R. M. MacIver, *Society* (New York: Farrar & Rhinehart, 1947), p. vii and Robert L. Sutherland and Julian L. Woodward, *Introductory Sociology* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1940), p. 3. A total of five "operational" definitions were eliminated in the course of the study.

statement of Dodd's willingness to accept the consensus of his professional colleagues' judgment as to the nature of sociology.

The sample thus obtained was too casually chosen to be adequate. The next step, therefore, was to eliminate names from those groups which appeared to be overrepresented until, in the writer's judgment, the remainder constituted a sample fairly well stratified by country, date, and school of thought. Of the 81 definitions remaining, 3 were published before 1900; 13, from 1900 to 1919; 42, from 1920 to 1939; 20 in 1940 or thereafter; and 3 were undated. There were 10 definitions from France or Belgium; 12, from Germany or Austria; 9, from other European countries; 11, from Hispanic America; and 39, from the United States. It was hard to classify the definitions by schools since no generally recognized classification exists; but all the principal shades of opinion were represented from the physicalism of Neurath to the somewhat mystical Catholicism of Sturzo, from the Neopositivism of Lundberg to the *verstehende Soziologie* of Weber. Eight definitions from dictionaries, both general and technical, were included to give a sampling of a broader type of opinion than that represented by the specialized works of individuals.<sup>2</sup>

The sample thus obtained depends on the writer's subjective judgment in various ways. Some may feel, for example, that the presence of 39 authors from the United States, of 11 from Hispanic America, or of 16 Catholic constitutes an overrepresentation of these categories. The choice of representative authors within each stratum was another process involving decisions open to question. Although the sample is probably not adequate enough to support detailed statistical analysis, the author feels confident that it is sufficient to indicate general trends and it will be used only for that purpose.

A good definition of a science should indicate both its material and its formal object. The material object of a science is the total range of subject matter which it considers; the formal object is the particular point

<sup>2</sup> The following is a complete list of the sources of the sample: Barnes, Bernard, Der Grosse Brockhaus, Carneiro Leao, Carr, Caso, Comte, Cornejo, Dawson-Gettys, Dealy-Ward, Delos, Derisi, Dictionary of Philosophy (ed. by Runes), Dictionary of Sociology (two alternative definitions), Dunkmann, Ford, Friedel, Giddings, Gillin-Gillin, Ginsberg, Groves-Moore, Gumpłowicz, Gundlach, Der Grosse Herder, Hiller, Hobhouse, Hostos, Jacquement, Kidd, Larousse du XXe Siècle, Lima, Lundberg, MacIver, McKevitt, MacLean, de Maday, Martinez Paz, Maunier, Mueller, Mulvaney, Muntsch-Spalding, Murray, Neurath, Oppenheimer, Shorter Oxford English Dictionary, Palante, Palmer, Panunzio, Paredes, Phelps, Poey, Prieto, Quesada, Ratzenhofer, Reuter, Rickert, Robinson-Christoph, E. A. Ross, E. J. Ross, Sales y Ferré, Sanderson, Seligman, Small, Smith, Sorokin, Spann, Spencer, Spirito, Stuckenberg, Sturzo, Taft, Tonnies, Ward, Waxweiler, Weber, Webster's New International Dictionary, Willigan-O'Connor, Worms, Wright-Elmer, Young. Some well-known names are missing from this list, principally because the writer could not find in their works a formal definition of sociology.

of view under which this subject matter is considered. The material object is generic; the formal object adds a specific difference. The material object viewed in the light of the formal object constitutes the "object of attribution" or simply the "object" of a science. A good definition of a science should make clear the object of attribution by mentioning the genus (material object) and the specific difference (formal object). Our sample of definitions will now be examined to see how well this is accomplished.<sup>3</sup>

All but 2 of the 81 definitions indicated somehow the material object of sociology; but the terminology employed was extremely various.<sup>4</sup> Some named an organizational entity such as "society" or "social groups." Others used terms designating static or dynamic social relationships such as "societal relations," "group relations," "human activities in their interrelation," "association," "living-together," "human togetherness as such," "group life," "social life," "collective behavior," or "social interaction." Some used such rather vague terms as "social phenomena" or "social reality." The influence of Durkheim was evident in a number of writers who used some equivalent of his *fait social*.<sup>5</sup> Among all these the most frequent single term for the material object of sociology was simply "society" which occurred in 14 of the 81 definitions.

This rich variety of terminology is a little disconcerting; but one may wonder whether the disagreement implied is, after all, very fundamental. Some of the terms are clearly synonymous. The distinction between "association" and "living-together," if it exists, must be a very subtle one. In other cases, although the semantic distinction is clear, it is hard to see how it makes much difference in practice. What would be the precise difference in the procedure of four sociologists who set out to study, respectively, "society," "societal relations," "group life," and "social phenomena"? Again, a careful analysis of the sample showed practically no correlation between an author's terminology for the material object

<sup>3</sup> A good treatment of the logical issues discussed in this paragraph is to be found in Tilman, Pesch, *Institutiones logicales* (2 vols. in 3, Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1888-90), vol. 1, pp. 558-61 and part 1 of vol. 2, pp. 564-65. What has been called formal object above is more precisely the *obiectum formale sub quo*. From the considerations adduced it will be possible to understand Pesch's alternative definition of the object of attribution: *id, quod propter se in aliqua disciplina consideratur, et ad quod omnia, quae in ea disciplina tractantur, referuntur*.

<sup>4</sup> The following is an example of a definition which omits the material object: "Soziologie ist nun die Wissenschaft der Staatsmannen und Organisatoren, das ist der Gesellschaftstechniker." Otto Neurath, *Empirische Soziologie* (Wien: Springer, 1931), p. 17.

<sup>5</sup> For an explanation of the term see, Emile Durkheim, *Les règles de la méthode sociologique* (2nd ed., Paris: Alcan, 1901), chapter 1, "Qu'est-ce qu'un fait social?"

and his particular school of sociological thought. Definitely, the tendency seemed to be to use these terms interchangeably.<sup>6</sup> One gets the impression that sociologists agree fundamentally on the material object of their science, but cannot agree on a standard term to express their common meaning.

When the definitions are analyzed from the standpoint of the formal object, the most striking finding which appears is the fact that the majority of them (47 out of the 81) fail to mention a formal object at all. An example of a definition which gives the material object without the formal object is the very simple one, "Sociology is the science of society."<sup>7</sup> This definition evidently defines social science in general, rather than any particular science within that category. It defines a genus, rather than a species. It is logically defective and needs to be narrowed down by the addition of a formal object which will serve as a specific difference and restrict the definition to the one science, sociology.

The 34 definitions which do mention a formal object are worded very variously. However, 27 of them either state explicitly or clearly imply that the distinctive feature of sociology, the feature which distinguishes it from the other social sciences, is its effort to discover generalizations wide enough to apply to all, or at least to many, of the areas of human association. Five years ago Father Friedel proposed that this should be considered the formal object of sociology and his opinion seems to be supported by most of those published definitions which are clear on the point.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Thus E. J. Ross, *Fundamental Sociology* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1939), p. 8 gives the material object of sociology in one paragraph as "society," "man's relations with his fellow men," and "social life." Edward B. Reuter, *Handbook of Sociology* (New York: Dryden, 1941), p. 12 and p. 157, gives two definitions of sociology in one of which the material object appears as "group life and human behavior" while in the other it is given as "the processes of social interaction that result in human personality." It is apparent that sociologists do not attach much importance to such differences of terminology. <sup>7</sup> Given, for example, by Ross, *loc. cit.*, and by John H. W. Stuckenberg in a book whose very title implies this definition, *Sociology, the Science of Human Society* (2 vols., New York: Putman's, 1903), vol. 1 p. 1. Franklin H. Giddings, *Inductive Sociology* (New York: Macmillan, 1901), p. 7, gives it in the equivalent form, "Sociology is a scientific study of society." See also, Enrique Martinez Paz (*Los elementos de la sociología* (Córdoba: Beltran y Rossi, 1911), p. 29, "La ciencia que estudia la sociedad humana en abstracto." Authors who give this simple definition generally supplement it with a fuller explanation.

<sup>8</sup> He wrote that sociology "seeks to discover formulae of generalizations that cut across all human association." Francis J. Friedel, "The Formal Object of the Social Sciences," *Am. Cath. Soc. Rev.*, 4(1943), pp. 16-24, quotation on p. 21. Many definitions imply the same viewpoint, but are less explicit. Thus Luigi Sturzo, "Sociology of the Supernatural," *Am. Cath. Soc. Rev.*, 3(1942), pp. 204-14, says that sociology studies society "with the aim of discovering the inner laws that are bound up with its very nature" (n. 204). Constantine Panunzio, *A Student's Dictionary of Sociological Terms* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1937), p. 37, states that sociology "ideals with the collective, unspecialized aspects of human behavior."



It is interesting to ask, on the basis of the sample being studied, what can be considered the most typical definition of sociology, the definition representing the central tendency of the whole sample. Since the material object most frequently mentioned was society and since in the majority of cases no formal object was stated, the most typical definition would perhaps be simply, "Sociology is the science of society," a definition already rejected as logically incomplete. It is more significant to inquire what definition among those logically complete is most typical. Such a definition would give society or some equivalent as the material object and as the formal object the effort of sociology to attain generalizations with the widest possible application. This definition was approximated by Sorokin when he defined sociology as "a science of the most general characteristics common to all classes of social phenomena and the correlations which exist between these classes" and by Lundberg when he wrote, "The characteristics and relationships common to all societal phenomena or social situations are, then, the proper concern of the field of general sociology."<sup>9</sup> It is encouraging to find writers as ideologically divergent as Sorokin and Lundberg agreeing so well in their definitions. Probably most sociologists would agree essentially with them. Indeed, in the entire sample there was only one definition which seemed flatly to contradict the typical definition of the Sorokin-Lundberg type.<sup>10</sup>

Thus this paper reaches the conclusion that there is not, after all, very much divergence among representative sociologists as to the definition of sociology. This is a rather surprising conclusion. If it is true, how can one explain the disputes which are familiar to every reader of the literature? It is convenient to answer this question by distinguishing three varieties of disagreement. First, there is disagreement of a purely verbal character. Some writers seem to be strongly attached to their own phraseology and they vehemently reject alternative phrasing which, objectively considered, would seem to be synonymous. Such disputes may be safely disregarded as mere logomachy.

A second type of dispute has to do with method. In this case the

<sup>9</sup> Pitirim Sorokin, *Contemporary Sociological Theories* (New York: Harper, 1928), p. 506, footnote. George A. Lundberg, *Foundations of Sociology* (New York: Macmillan, 1939), p. 97.

<sup>10</sup> Octavio Nicolas Derisi, *La estructura noetica de la sociología* (Buenos Aires: Cursos de Cultura Catolica, 1938), p. 91 and p. 102, denies sociology the status of an independent science and reduces it to part of ethics. Two other rather divergent viewpoints are those of G. Palante, *Précis de sociologie* (6th ed., Paris: Alcan, 1921), p. 3, who identifies sociology with social psychology, and of Manuel Sales y Ferré, *Tratado de sociología* (4 vols., Madrid: Suárez, 1889-97), vol. 1, p. viii, who identifies it with the philosophy of history. In these two instances, however, the context seems to indicate that the divergence is more apparent than real.

disagreement is both real and important, but it is hard to see why it need necessarily lead to a parallel disagreement on definition. A good definition of sociology must specify the type of generalization to be sought by the science, but there is no reason why it must predetermine the methods by which such generalizations are to be sought. One may define chemistry without specifying in advance whether or not the chemist is to use an analytical balance; the balance justifies itself afterwards by proving useful in the attainment of the objectives defined for the science. So, too, one may define sociology without prejudging the value of possible methodologies. Whether empathy or strictly statistical analysis or both or neither should be employed is a question to be settled *a posteriori* by the usefulness of each method in attaining truly sociological generalizations which can stand up under the criticism of the logic of science.

There is a third type of disagreement which is more significant. Even after the various sciences have been very carefully defined, it may be found that they overlap at certain points and disputes arise over the responsibility for the common territory. It is important to understand the precise nature of the overlap which gives rise to the difficulty. It is an overlap of formal objects; for overlap of material objects raises no problem. Biology and chemistry both study animals; but biology is interested in them as living organisms while chemistry considers the properties of the various elements and compounds which occur in the bodies of animals as well as elsewhere in the universe. There is a point, however, where these two interests overlap. One may be interested in the correlation of the two formal objects and inquire how various chemical compounds are involved in various vital processes. Thus arises the broad field of biochemistry in which both chemistry and biology are involved by the nature of their formal objects.

Instances of such overlap are very common in the sciences and scientists seems to accept them complacently—except in sociology. Here alone they give rise to acrimonious dispute. This hardly seems logical. Why should we be upset, for example, because there is an area in which the formal objects of sociology and ethics overlap? Sociology is primarily concerned with what is; ethics, with what ought to be. Is it not perfectly legitimate to study the relation between the two, to make ethical judgments about the actual functioning of society? Is it not also perfectly clear that to make such judgments accurately one must call on the special skills of both the sociologist and the ethicist? It is hard to be patient with the narrow dogmatism of those who assert that sociologists must systematically avoid ethical problems. A scientist would be laughed out of court if he should claim that a biologist must never borrow data from chemistry.



The present paper has shown that there actually exists a rather wide agreement among sociologists as to the nature of their science. Sociology is conceived as a science which studies society or human association or societal relationships with the object of discovering the broadest generalizations applying within the area. Disputes about the definition of sociology should cease if we are careful to remember three things. First, differences of phraseology are unimportant. There exists no science defined by a standard definition whose exact wording is universally accepted. Secondly, the methods to be used in sociological research need not be specified in the definition; therefore disagreement on methodology does not bar agreement in defining sociology. Thirdly, a definition specifies a central area of interest, but it does not specify rigid limits beyond which the scientist must not dare to trespass. The sociologist, as a sociologist, may study anything at all within the whole range of possible human knowledge as long as it promises to throw some light on his central interest, namely, broad generalizations applicable to human society.

*Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.*

## The Relation of Financial Assessment to Status In A Rural Parish\*

C. J. NUESSE

THIS PAPER explains a method for studying certain aspects of parish life and reports the results of its application in a particular case. Attention is focused upon the relationship between formal and informal elements of parochial organization, in so far as this is revealed by the functioning of a system of classified assessments for dues, applied in a rural parish from its beginning until 1946. The hypothesis is that in differentiating several classes of contributors the parishioners recognized, not merely differences in ability to pay, but also differences in prestige within the parish group. Analysis reveals the sources of such prestige differences and their effects within the formal organization of the parish.

The parish studied is located in a rural area of the northern Middle West. It was organized during the 1880's as a mission of the Catholic church in the county seat some six miles distant, now a small town of about 6,500 inhabitants, and the only population aggregate over village size in the county. Church, rectory, school, and cemetery are situated in a hamlet with less than a hundred persons. Other service agencies in this center are a grocery, tavern, garage, and public consolidated elementary and high school. Membership in the parish has increased at a fairly steady rate since its founding. In 1945, at the time of study, it included 166 family units and twenty single persons. Most of the parishioners are farmers, some of whom have small orchards, since the parish lies within a fruit-growing region. There are also proprietors of small business or industrial establishments, fishermen, skilled and unskilled laborers, and retired persons. Ethnically the parish began with an overwhelmingly German base, though several Irish immigrant families were among its founders. People of Belgian, Bohemian, English, French, Norwegian, and Polish descent have moved into the parish and intermarried. The third generation in the assimilation cycle has reached adulthood and, though the German background is still evident, the ethnic factor has long since ceased to be of significance.

\* Presented to a convention meeting on the sociology of the parish at the Ninth Annual Convention of the American Catholic Sociological Society, St. Louis, Missouri, January 30—February 1, 1948.

## THE DEFINITION OF FINANCIAL OBLIGATIONS IN THE PARISH

*The system of assessments.*—Until 1946 the chief source of revenue in the parish was a survival of the "pew rent" which was introduced when the parish was founded. In the early years each contributing unit was assigned a definite pew in the church, and some members of the older families still occupy their familiar places at Sunday Mass and parochial devotions. Pew rents were determined for each family or individual member by an assessment board, chosen at the annual parish meeting, under the supervision of the pastor and two lay trustees, also elected by the parish. Formal renting of pews was abandoned about twenty years ago, but the term "Pew Rent" headed the appropriate column on the financial reports until 1945, when it was replaced by "Dues." The method of assessment was not changed.

Dues were based explicitly on the principle of ability to pay, expressed locally as "what they can afford." Several classifications were differentiated at an early date. For purposes of this report they are designated by letters ("A" representing the highest amount, "B" the next highest, etc.), though no such symbols were used in the parish. In 1945 the assessment in Class A was \$32, in B \$27, in C \$22, in D \$15 to \$18 with \$17 as the mode, in E \$14, and in F \$12 or less. Between 1912 and 1945, the period encompassed by this study, the amount of the assessment in each class increased by approximately one-third as a result of rising price levels, increased operating costs, and the attainment of higher living standards in the area. These general classifications for dues were followed also in fixing assessments for building and improvement funds, but with fewer gradations.

As might be expected, the test of ability to pay used by the assessment board could seldom be truly objective, except in so far as size of farm, volume of production or sales, knowledge of inheritances, and similar factors were taken into account. The reputation for wealth and income attributed to a member in the community and his willingness to pay were undoubtedly the most pertinent considerations. Prestige factors were therefore almost inevitably, if subtly, involved in this determination. A few families, for example, seem to have remained in Class A despite known changes in economic status which would have made them eligible for reclassification downward. Without discounting their good will, prestige attached to identification as a founding family in the parish, or to the occupation of parish offices, or to leadership positions outside the parish, apparently made such families reluctant to seek readjustments. On the

other hand, families enjoying relatively high prestige were not always among the largest contributors.

*Institutional character of the system.*—Under this system of assessments, the definition of a parishioner's obligations for the support of the parish were clear and explicit. No parishioner could be in doubt as to the amount expected of him. Furthermore, the degree to which his financial obligations were fulfilled became public knowledge in the parish and even outside it through the medium of printed financial reports. These reports were distributed annually to all members, to diocesan officials, and to other interested parties. Payments of dues were noted, as were contributions to building and improvement funds, and the like; delinquencies were specifically charged, both for the current year and cumulatively. Even amounts contributed to diocesan collections were sometimes reported. It may be said that, except for personal gifts of money or goods to the pastors or to the sisters teaching in the parish school—and usually not even in these cases—almost no contributions could be made without becoming generally known.

Definite sanctions were invoked upon delinquents, though pastors, usually after consultation with the trustees, occasionally scaled down or cancelled the debts of those manifestly unable to contribute. A long-standing rule in the parish specified that persons failing to pay something toward their dues for three successive years might no longer be considered members. Excerpts from a pastor's statement prefacing the financial reports for 1906 and 1907 illustrate the use of this sanction:

There are some names, of former members of the congregation, who are not mentioned, and will not be mentioned any more, as according to the rules of our incorporation, they are no longer members; who, do not support the church. They will be treated according to the rules of the incorporation and the rules of the diocese of———.

Those who live in the congregation and are married must give in their names to the Secretary that he may record them in the books of the congregation, otherwise they cannot expect any service from the congregation—those who have rented a pew in their own name, need not, as this implies membership. All self-supporting young men and women, should pay a certain due for support of congregation.

A part of this statement was repeated almost verbatim by another pastor in 1925. Sometimes the names of delinquents were read from the pulpit. On a few occasions, delinquents who had been dropped from the rolls were refused the sacraments, and the bodies of some who died without restoration to membership were left in the vestibule of the church during their funeral masses. In addition to these sanctions, less frequently in-

voked and seemingly less necessary in later years, pastors "talked money," some more, some less, and each in his own fashion.

Further proof that members' dues were defined with clarity is found in the exactness with which assessments were met. The amount assessed was viewed as a maximum as well as a minimum. Dues were clearly regarded as obligations, "just debts," not as donations given out of a benevolent or charitable spirit, as might be the case in many urban parishes. Donations, in varying amounts according to wealth and inclination, were given at various times—to the pastor's Christmas and Easter collections, to supplying the sisters' kitchen, to the annual dinner and other parish socials, perhaps to purchase a stained-glass window or a statute—but they were made to the general funds of the parish.

*Tendencies toward equalization.*—In this, as well as in other respects, a kind of equalitarianism seems to have characterized the parishioners. Though members' incomes varied considerably within a limited range, economic differences were blurred by the hard work of a common occupation and by long intimate acquaintance. Status differences based upon economic condition, respectability of conduct, personal initiative, and sociability existed in the community, but in spite of them parishioners in the higher-paying classifications sometimes professed to think of equality of contribution as the most desirable system of parish finance. Some compared their annual payments with those of others in lower classes and remarked, "They could pay it, too, if they wanted to!"; others complained, "I'm paying too much." In contrast, some of those in lower brackets said of those in higher, "They can afford it, let them pay it."

Consistent with the equalitarian tendency, the assessment system was revised by action taken at the parish meeting in 1946. The recommendations adopted at that time were made by the three members of the assessment board, all under forty and of the third generation in the parish. Since January 1, 1946, all married couples with or without children, have been assessed \$24 annually; all single persons, including widows and partners to mixed marriages, with or without children, and adult unmarried persons, have been assessed \$12. If this levy provides sufficient revenue and survives possible future periods of economic hardship, it may produce changes in attitudes toward church support. While its adoption was an outgrowth of the equalitarian tendency noted, it was made possible in the concrete event by the improvement in the economic condition of many farmers during the war years.

## THE ANALYSIS OF THE ASSESSMENT CLASSIFICATIONS

*Sources of data.*—In the preparation of this paper, which deals with the significance of the old assessment classifications, the published annual reports have provided the basic source of data. These were issued with some lapses during the early years of the parish, but have appeared regularly since 1912. Supplementary information pertaining to such matters as family composition, occupations, ownership and tenure status, kinship affiliations, and participation of members, might have been obtained most accurately from a parish census, were such a source available. All the types of data mentioned, however, constitute virtual public knowledge in a parish where each member knows nearly all other members. Hence, where the author's personal knowledge, obtained from intimate acquaintance in the parish since childhood, was wanting, information was sought from two special informants, or obtained from other parish members by concealed interviews. One informant was a lady in late middle age, the wife of a son of a founding family, long prominent in parish affairs; the other was a married woman of about thirty, a native of the parish, and well acquainted with the younger age-groups, though not a leader in parish activities. The data were compiled at the end of 1945, the last year in which the old classifications were applied. In what follows interpretations based upon the author's observation and questioning may be easily distinguished from those based upon statistical compilations.<sup>1</sup>

*Distribution of membership units.*—The parish report for 1945 listed 186 membership units, exclusive of 47 young unmarried persons living with their families but contributing independently to the amount of five or ten dollars each. Young men and women out of high school and employed were expected to make such contributions, though their membership might still be derived through their families. Persons moving in or out of the parish, or those deceased before making their full contributions for the year, temporary (summer) residents, and others whose contributions were not part of the regular financial structure—ten units in all—have been excluded from the analysis. Of the 186 units studied, 166 were families, 20 were single persons (widowed, separated, or unmarried) unattached to families in the parish. Most of the latter were in the lowest-paying class. There were 42 units in Class A, 45 in B, 30 each in C and D, 12 in E, and 27 in F.

<sup>1</sup> Statistical tables have been omitted in order to conserve space, but will be supplied by the author upon request.

*Analytical procedures.*—A cursory review of the distribution of membership units among the classifications suggested the central hypothesis of the study—the relation of financial obligations to prestige differences within the parish group. Systematic study required the formulation of several subsidiary hypotheses which could be tested by a comparative analysis of the composition of the assessment classes. By this process, two important sources of prestige differences have been identified: first, the relative positions of the membership units in the so-called cycle of family development; and, second, their relative positions within the informal rank order of the community. Other hypotheses, concerning the operation of the prestige differences within the formal structure of the parish, have been verified by comparisons among the assessment classes with regard to participation of members in activities and office-holding. Evidence bearing upon these points will be reviewed in detail.

#### ASSESSMENT CLASSIFICATIONS AND FAMILY CYCLES

The most obvious and the explicitly recognized purpose of the differential assessment classifications, already pointed out, was to relate the obligations of members to their financial abilities. Since these abilities vary with stages in the growth of families,<sup>1a</sup> it is not surprising that, looked at from one aspect, the classifications corresponded roughly with successive stages in the occupational lives and responsibilities of members. The fact that most units classified in A in 1945 had moved upward from lower assessment levels, almost half of them from D, substantiates this generalization. Differential payments of dues evidently symbolized various steps in advance toward recognition as fully responsible members of the parish and the community.

*Types of membership units.*—This is clearly seen when the types of membership units within each classification are examined. The first four classes comprised 81 per cent of all units and were composed almost entirely of families. Only Class D included any other type of unit, one-third of its membership being composed of broken families, partners to mixed marriages, widowed and separated persons. Class E consisted of twelve partners to mixed marriages and their children. Though this classification was reserved for such units, four others of like kind were

<sup>1a</sup> A detailed study of these variations has been made by E. L. Kirkpatrick, Rosalind Tough, and May Cowles, *The Life Cycles of the Farm Family in Relation to Standard of Living* (University of Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Research Bulletin 121; Madison: 1934). For a summary, J. H. Kolb and Edmund deS. Brunner, *A Study of Rural Society* (3d ed.; Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1948), 213-15.



in Class D and seven in Class F. The latter had, in addition, broken-families, widowed and unmarried persons unattached to other units. Classes A and B, but not the others, included a few composite family units, composed of widowed parents and the families of their sons or daughters. In other cases parental couples or widowed persons lived with the families of their children but paid dues as separate units. These latter types have been deemed significant in calling to mind the importance of continuity of family residence for the stability of the parish.

*Characteristics of membership units.*—A review of selected characteristics of membership units in each classification will illustrate further the relationship of the assessment system to family cycles. Families in Class A were at relatively advanced stages of development. While about one-fourth of the heads of these units were still under 45 years of age, one-half were between 45 and 65, and the remaining one-fourth over 65. Only one-third had entered the parish by migration and only one family had held membership in the parish for less than five years. About one-fourth of the units had been listed as members for the entire thirty-four year period from 1912 to 1946. The median period of membership was over twenty-one years, and the median period within the assessment class between ten and eleven years. Children of these units had already graduated from high school in most cases, and the older ones had founded new families, some of them remaining to help operate the family farms and eventually take them over, others establishing themselves independently.

In Class B one-half the heads of families were under 45. About one-third were over 65 and, in most cases, recently reclassified from A because of changed income status due to age, reduced earning capacity, and retirement. As in A, only about one-third the units had migrated into the parish, but one-fourth had held membership for less than five years. The younger half of the families in this bracket had been member units for from five to fifteen years, but had paid Class B assessments for hardly more than two years. Their children were still attending the parochial school.

Almost two-thirds the heads of units in Class C were between 45 and 65, and one-half of them had migrated into the parish. Some families in this class were older, having moved downward from higher assessments; some were younger, natives of the parish, moving upward in classification. One-third of all units had been members for less than five years, and both the young natives and the in-migrants were likely to have been classified upward from D only within the two or three years previous to 1945. Children in this group were still in grade and high school.



Class D included a few families who were members of long standing but seemingly unreliable in discharging financial obligations to the parish, some who had been reclassified downward because of age, and several young natives of the parish, but mostly recent in-migration. Two-thirds of all units in this class were migrants into the parish. One-half had been listed as members for less than five years. Children in most of these families were still quite young.

Classes E and F obviously provided for atypical family situations and for unattached persons, many of whom were survivors in the declining periods of their families. The twelve partners to mixed marriages in E were mostly parish-born, under 45, and with children of pre-school or grade-school age. Widowed and unmarried men and women, some living with family units and others not, and some wives of Protestant husbands with their children, accounted for the irregular-sized contributions in F.

On the whole, the relation between assessments and stages in family cycles seems obvious. It becomes even clearer when occupational and ownership characteristics are considered.

#### ASSESSMENT CLASSIFICATIONS AND PRESTIGE IN THE COMMUNITY

The evidence already introduced seems to point to other sources of prestige than family maturity. The fact that some members were retarded in mobility from lower to higher classifications, for example, suggests possible differences in economic status and perhaps social rank. Judged by age and previous mobility, one-fifth of the members in Classes B and C had probably reached their highest assessment classifications in 1945, indicating that their assessments constituted practical recognition of their lower economic status as compared with fellow-parishioners. Thus, the differential assessments may well be viewed as one of the mechanisms through which prestige in the community became involved in the status system of the parish. Without previous scientific study of prestige ratings in the community, this hypothesis could be tested only in a general way by noting such things as occupations and ownership of property, regularity in the fulfillment of obligations, and kinship affiliations.

*Occupations.*—Occupational and ownership characteristics were important differentiating factors. The majority of all units, 62.3 per cent, represented farm families. Approximately 70 per cent of the heads of these farm units were full-time owner-operators, and this latter figure would have been increased substantially by the inclusion of units headed

by farm wives who were partners to mixed marriages. No farmer in the parish was a renter; non-owning operators were either sons of owners on the home farms or hired managers. Only eight units were headed by farm laborers.

A breakdown discloses that over two-thirds of the units in Class A were headed by farmers, all of them owner-operators. All of the farmers with small orchards, except one, were in this class. Just over one-half the units in B and two-thirds in C were headed by farm owner-operators; those remaining in each case were mostly non-farm laborers. In D there was a nearly equal division between farm and non-farm occupations, but only one-fifth the heads of units were owner-operators of farm. Ten of the twelve partners to mixed marriages in E were either owner-operators of the wives of owner-operators. Most members in F were housewives, persons in non-farm occupations, or retired, though one unmarried owner-operator of a farm was included. Differences in economic position therefore were quite recognizable.

*Kinship affiliations.*—Since the prestige involved in social rank is generally regarded as a family rather than individual attribute,<sup>2</sup> an attempt has been made to obtain additional objective data regarding the presence of prestige distinctions by noting kinship affiliations of members within the parish. Taking into account only immediate relatives—that is, parents, children, or siblings—members in classes A and B were related within their assessment class two or three times more frequently than those in C and D. Roughly one-third of the units in C and one-half in D had no immediate relatives in the parish. Though these results are of doubtful significance, in a parish where members are related to a considerable extent they probably indicate stratification.

*Delinquency in payment of dues.*—Further evidence bearing on this problem has been taken from a comparison of the classifications on the basis of their delinquency records in payments of dues. At the time of study, one unit in Class A, five in B, seven in C, nine in D, one in E, and six in F, were in arrears. These represented the lowest number of delinquent units by far for any year in parish history. About 40 per cent of the units in Classes A and B had never been in arrears during their entire

<sup>2</sup> The Yankee City study of family membership allegedly "demonstrated that the vast majority of families had but one class represented in their membership." W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, *The Social Life of a Modern Community* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), 90. See also, Harold F. Kaufman, *Prestige Classes in a New York Rural Community* (Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, Memoir 260; Ithaca: 1944), and James West, *Plainville, U.S.A.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1945), *passim*.

periods of membership. Though, statistically, similar or even higher proportions in the other classes had never been in arrears, the short average periods of membership made the fact virtually insignificant. On the other hand, while 24 and 29 per cent of the units in Classes A and B respectively had been delinquent for more than one-fourth of their periods of membership, over 50 per cent of the units in C and D had been delinquent to this extent. Moreover, 17 per cent of the units in C and 23 per cent in D had been delinquent at least three out of every four years of their membership. These figures would seem to indicate differences in attitudes toward financial obligations which might well have been related to prestige values.

To the limited extent that these factors may be taken as evidence of social stratification, they appear to show the influence of prestige in the community upon the status system of the parish. The most significant cleavage was apparently between Classes A and B on the one hand, and C and D on the other. A study of the prestige classes of the community, however, would undoubtedly have revealed distinctions even among the families of the higher assessment classifications.

#### ASSESSMENT CLASSIFICATIONS AND PARTICIPATION

If prestige deriving from standing in the community and position in the family cycle is related to the assessment classifications in the manner which has been suggested, it is logical to expect it to be reflected in differential participation in parish activities.<sup>3</sup> Since a complete statistical survey of participation could not be made, the informants and the author cooperatively rated each membership unit as "active," "regular," or "minimal," with regard to the participation of its adult members in parish activities. These included singing in the choir, ushering, cooperating in card parties and dinners and similar fund-raising activities, volunteering to help clean the church and school, attending meetings of organizations, holding offices, and all other activities except those of a purely religious nature. Those who displayed more than usual initiative and responsibility were rated as "active," those who were cooperative nearly all of the time were rated as "regular," while those who at best did no more than a

<sup>3</sup> Two articles by W. A. Anderson, "The Family and Individual Social Participation," *American Sociological Review*, 8: 420-24, August 1943; and "Family Social Participation and Social Status Self-Ratings," *ibid.*, 11: 253-58, June 1946, are especially relevant. It is shown that participation, at least in rural areas, is a family trait, that upper-class rural families are the participators, and that self-judgments of participation and social status are closely correlated with measures of actual participation.

minimum amount of work in these activities were rated as "minimal" participants. The subjective basis of these ratings is acknowledged, and it should be noted further that they were given by informants who were themselves regular or active participants.

Of the 186 membership units studied, only 28 were rated as active, and 15 of these were in Class A, nine in Class B. Fifty-four were rated as regular, and of these 15 each were in Classes A and B. The remaining 104 were rated as minimal. Within Class A there was an approximately equal division among the three ratings, but in Class B almost half, in Classes C and D two-thirds, in Class E over half, and in Class F almost 90 per cent were rated as minimal participants. These differences seem very clear. As the informants recognized, they were partly explicable by such excusing conditions as the presence of small children in the home, illness or physical disability, age, distance from church, and tension in mixed marriages. Inasmuch as these factors were present, there is additional evidence of the relation of the family cycle to the participation of members, but even when allowance is made for them, there seems to be presumptive evidence of the influence of prestige in the community upon participation.

#### ASSESSMENT CLASSIFICATIONS AND ELECTION TO PARISH OFFICES

In the same way, the operation of informal prestige factors was observed in the selection of parish officials. Lay officers were selected to perform certain specialized functions. Since they were elected, they were not only required to possess the necessary formal qualifications for office, but also had to be recognized as possessing such qualifications in combination with sufficient prestige to gain the support of fellow-parishioners. On the basis of the data presented, it could be foreseen that parish officials would be selected from the higher assessment classifications.

This was in fact the case during the thirty-four years covered by this study. The most important lay officers in the parish were the two trustees, elected for terms of two years each. Only eight men occupied this office during the period. At the time of their election four were in Class A; the other four, in B when elected, were reclassified in A after from one to four years incumbency. The importance of community prestige was illustrated in the remark of one of the informants concerning a trustee who was in Class B and also in arrears when elected, "Fred Schmidt never paid the top amount, but he was always Fred Schmidt, don't you know?"

Six of the eight trustees were born in the parish of German or Irish immigrant stock; the in-migrants, both converts to the Church, were elected after fifteen and twenty-five years residence respectively. All trustees were farmers with reputations for conservatism and some foresight and caution in financial matters. Apparently they had an awareness of their personal "stakes" in the parish, and this was symbolized to some extent by their assessment classifications.

Informal qualifications for election to office were probably more flexible in parish organizations, but the same general pattern was discernible. The most active organization by far was the Ladies' Altar Society, which customarily included most of the adult women of the parish. This group took a vital part in raising funds, in furnishing and maintaining parish buildings, and similar matters. Eight women were presidents of the society during the period, one during the first fifteen years of this study, at the same time that her husband was a trustee of the parish, the others since. Three of the first four presidents were members of families in Class A when elected, the other belonged to a Class B unit soon reclassified in A. During the last nine years before 1946 the four ladies elected were of a younger age group and members of families rising steadily to higher classifications, except for one who was in the special classification for partners to mixed marriages. By 1945 all except this one had risen to Classes B or A. In the case of this organization, as in the case of the trustees, therefore, assessment classification was seemingly indicative of social characteristics supplying the prestige necessary for election to office.

### CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this report must be stated with caution. The design of the research has been too limited to reveal all the criteria for prestige distinctions in the parish and the community. No suggestion of an exact correlation between prestige classes and assessment classifications has been intended. Nor has any proof been found to warrant an assertion that the economic factor was the decisive one in the ascription of status. The evidence bearing on this point shows rather that it operated within a complex of interrelated factors. Other studies of the social participation and prestige rankings of members are needed to deal with related aspects of the parish structure.

That the assessment classifications in the rural parish studied were related to prestige distinctions seems clear enough nevertheless, especially

in view of the differential participation of members and the selection of officials from a limited assessment range. Analysis of the composition of the several classifications has revealed that these distinctions were derived in great measure from the prestige of membership units in the more extensive social system of the community, and that further distinctions were made within the parish according to the positions of the units within the family cycle. The assessment classifications, therefore, had a certain symbolic value within the status system of the parish.

The method which has been employed has proved fruitful in illustrating how informal organization within the parish is derived in part from intra-group action, in part from relations of members beyond the boundaries of the group. Theoretically, the status system of the parish may be conceived as related reciprocally with the wider system of the community or local region. On the one hand, prestige within the parish may be simply a reflection of status within the community; on the other, the ascription or attainment of status within the parish may enhance prestige within the community or some other group. The accumulation of studies of this problem would no doubt yield greater insight into the mechanisms by which parochial status systems and parochial membership roles are developed and maintained.

*The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.*

## The Sociology of Jose Medina Echavarria<sup>1</sup>

STUART A. QUEEN

“THE WORD sociology by itself gives us no precise idea of the content of that science.” (R75)<sup>2</sup> An amazing variety of problems, data, methods, and opinions have been given the label sociological, ever since the days of Auguste Comte, whose work displayed a system of philosophy, zeal for social reform, and a program for developing a new science. Even today, after 100 years, we find press and radio applying the name sociologist to kind ladies who visit the poor, journalists eager to reform our penal institutions, clergymen who preach good will among men, professors who speculate about the nature of society, and researchers who assemble concrete data to test hypotheses about human relations.

Concerned about this confusion, a contemporary Spanish sociologist, Jose Medina Echavarria, has set himself the task of outlining anew the objectives, procedures, and subject matter that might fruitfully engage the attention of people called sociologists. He formulated his problems in terms of what he called “dichotomies.”

1. “Ques es lo social?” What kinds of stuff shall sociologists work with? Are they like the data of natural science or are they something different? Are they amenable to some kind of manipulation? Thus he wrestles with the dichotomy: *naturalismo versus culturalismo*.

2. Is the task of sociologists one of synthesis or of specialization? If they follow the encyclopedic patterns of Comte, Spencer, and Ward, there is a further problem: shall they attempt to write the various social sciences into a single discipline, or shall they undertake a more modest integration, tying up loose ends and emphasizing interrelationships? If, instead of synthesizers, they become specialists, shall they work only with data not used by other social sciences, or shall their contribution be a

1. Was born December 25, 1903 in Spain. He received a doctorate in Law at the University of Madrid, and later studied in France and Germany. During or after the Civil War, he went to Mexico where he became a professor in the National University. He has also been visiting professor at the National University of Columbia and is now teaching at the University of Puerto Rico. He is author of 7 books, 3 of which have been used in preparing this paper.

2. References in this paper are to three books by José Medina Echavarria: R—*Responsabilidad de la inteligencia* (1943); C—*Panorama de la sociología contemporánea* (1940); T—*Sociología, teoría y técnica* (1941). The numbers after the letters indicate pages.



distinctive formulation of problems or points of view? The second dichotomy then is *synthesis versus especialismo*.

3. What kind of statements may be expected to emerge from the studies of sociologists? Descriptions of unique social events and situations or generalizations based on the identification of similarities and relationships? In other words, is the goal the comprehension of individual phenomena or the construction of general laws? The third dichotomy is *lo idiografico versus lo nomothetico*.

4. This leads naturally to the dichotomy: *teoria versus tecnica*, i.e., systematic or general sociology versus the concrete and detailed social research.

5. Finally, what attitude should sociologists assume—that of dispassionate study of what is and how it came to be, or the passing of moral judgment and the partisan support of “causes.” Here there are really two “dichotomies: *science versus ethics*, and *the academic versus the practical*. Let us see how Jose Medina Echavarria deals with the imposing body of methodological problems.

1. We start with the question: what is the kind of stuff with which sociologists are to deal? In various places Medina Echavarria indicates that the materials of sociology properly include:

- a. Processes of interaction such as competition, conflict, imitation, cooperation.
- b. Social groups, their structure, life cycles, and relations with other groups.
- c. The products of group living, such as folkways, mores, institutions, and configurations or culture patterns.
- d. Ecology or the adjustment of societies to their environments.
- e. Personality as affected by or developed in groups with their cultural setting.

This is my own outline of items scattered through Medina's books. His own outline is this (C 21):

Preliminary studies

History of social thought  
 Logic of the social sciences  
 Empirical studies—descriptive, comparative,  
     classificatory (*tipificadora*)  
 Strictly sociological studies  
 Social psychology  
 Theory of social relations  
 Theory of social structures

## Complementary studies

Comparative theory of organization in general

Theory of history

Theory of norms in general

Social technology

All this sounds fairly familiar to us North Americans. But the problem is not quite so simple as it seems. Are we to study social processes, interrelationships, and their products only in terms of tangible items such as placement in time and space, material culture, and overt behavior? Or must we look for something "beneath" or "behind" these "externals?"

If we confine ourselves to concrete data which can be seen, heard, and manipulated, we can hope to utilize research techniques similar to those of the physical sciences. We can measure and count, we can compute correlations and perhaps make predictions; we can check each other's work and verify each other's findings. But if we restrict ourselves to physical traits and overt activities, are we not missing something essentially human and social? What about morale, esprit de corps, consensus, tradition, mores, tension, prejudice? Can these be ignored merely because they are intangible? Medina Echavarria thinks not.

On the other hand, he rejects the view that one can go directly at the intangible "social reality" by "intuitive penetration" or "endopathic comprehension." Social reality is both "natural" and "symbolic." (T 60) We may start with the observation of a group of people behaving in some concrete fashion and end with our interpretation of their behaviour in terms of leadership, rivalry, loyalty, fear, or some other intangible. This imputation of mental or cultural or interpersonal elements is in part based on observation, in part on the projection of personal experience, and in part on inference. There is nothing mysterious or "unnatural" about either the data or the procedure. They do not call for a "sixth sense" nor an esoteric mental process. Just as in the physical sciences, so in sociology, we utilize tangible data to test hypotheses which are mental constructs. Thus, in effect, Medina Echavarria disposes of the dichotomy *naturalismo versus culturalismo*.

2. In the second dichotomy, he is concerned with the opposition aroused by the encyclopedic character of the works of Comte, Spencer, and some of their successors. Representatives of the older, more specialized disciplines of economics, political science, history, and philosophy resented the encroachment of the newcomers. They argued that the latter, having no distinctive field of inquiry, lacked a *raison d'être*; that their work was bound to be unnecessary duplication; that sociology could exist in its own right only by occupying itself with materials and problems not treated by

the older social sciences and related disciplines. Thus arose the dichotomy: *synthesis versus especialismo*.

Medina Echavarria calls this a false dilemma. (T 83) He holds that in a field so vast as that of social science there must be division of labor; but because all social phenomena appear to be interrelated in real life, there must be integration of the social sciences. (T 98-99) The basic question is not "whether" but "how."

As to this division of labor, we are reminded that the existing social sciences and other academic disciplines are to a large extent matters of convenience, and often the result of historic accident. There is nothing final about them; they do not exist *in rerum natura*. But there is a very practical question of how to divide the work in order that it may be done most effectively. This requires intermittent review of the whole field and a reconsideration of the skills and knowledge possessed by each group of specialists.

For sociologists two rather different proposals have been made. The first has already been mentioned: it is that they work at problems and with materials not used by the other social sciences. Such a problem might be that formulated by Simmel, namely, what are the forms of group life and how do they develop? Distinctive materials might include those pertaining to the family or the community. Some have spoken of a distinctively sociological point of view, but, except when they refer to what might be called an over-all view, they are rather vague. Moreover, why should not any or every specialist learn to view his particular assignment in relation to the whole of which it is a part? Medina Echavarria would have no quarrel with this last, but he seems to think that for some reason sociologists have a peculiar responsibility for integration and synthesis, along with whatever specialization they may undertake. Just why this should be more true of sociologists than of economists or psychologists, for example, he does not make clear. Perhaps he unwittingly permits historic accidents to guide his argument.

3. The third problem has to do with the possibility of valid generalizations about social phenomena. There are those whose attention is centered on the uniqueness of persons, groups, institutions, and events. They emphasize the "irrationality" of history and the impossibility of completely duplicating any occurrence. They discard the search for general "laws" in favor of "concrete causal connections." (T 77) This is essentially the position of a great many historians. On the other side Medina Echavarria argues that one cannot really engage in concrete description without a general theory of some sort. Such theory guides the inquirer in formulating questions and selecting materials, as well as in drawing con-

clusions. He does not say specifically that historians do this, but he does say that it is true of those who engage in empirical social research. (C 31)

What he almost says is that uniqueness exists in the physical world as well as in the social. Such uniqueness does not prevent fruitful search for similarities and relationships on the part of physicists and biologists. Neither need it prevent the search for generalizations by sociologists. He might have added that concrete case studies of persons, groups, or institutions are valuable, because they give vivid and detailed pictures; they offer clues to broader understanding, and open the way to comparative and statistical studies from which generalizations may be derived. The study of limited aspects of many cases, in turn, if productive of general principles, is the basis of sounder interpretation of individual cases. But Medina Echavarria did not go this far in his efforts to resolve the dichotomy of *ideographic versus nomothetic*.

4. The preceding discussion has already involved us in the dichotomy of *theory versus research*. Historically, and even today, there are social theorists who speculate about "society" without testing their propositions against the hard facts of every day life. They are opposed by gatherers of data who never organize their facts into any system. The latter sometimes develop elaborate devices for collecting material about public opinion, gangsters, city slums, and rural families. The armchair theorists give us unverified generalizations; the surveyors and "pollsters" give us a hodgepodge of curiosities. Latin-Americans and Germans are especially prone to unfounded speculation; North-Americans to inventing techniques and piling up collectors' items. (C 103, 181).

Medina Echavarria points out very clearly the dangers of both extremes, (T 158). What he advises is not merely a middle ground; it is rather a revamping and a synthesizing of theory and research. Because he states his position in abstract terms, I shall take the liberty of supplying my own illustrations.

Suppose we are interested in physical mobility and social organization. In a variety of ways we assemble miscellaneous data from which certain problems take shape and certain "hunches" emerge. We then settle down to the systematic study of the possible relationships between physical mobility and social organization. We plan the assembling of accurate and representative data about the mobility itself and about possibly related items, such as neighboring, delinquency, voting, etc. We collect life histories and case records, we conduct interviews with schedules in hand. We classify and compare, we tabulate and correlate, until finally we verify, modify or reject the hypothesis which developed earlier in our

study. Thus we combine social theory and social research, generalization and concrete description. (T Chap. 5).

5. Finally we come to the two related dichotomies of *academic versus practical* and *scientific versus ethical*. To recur to the illustration just employed, shall sociologists confine themselves to dispassionate study of physical mobility and social organization, or shall they consider practical applications of their findings to politics, education, and social work? Some fear that concern about practical problems, such as how to deal with school children retarded by frequent moving, will involve biases and blind the investigators to alternatives that might not conform to current folkways or administrative practices. For example, they might become so interested in how to stabilize transients that they would overlook the possibilities of changing the schools.

Others fear that eagerness to be objective may lead to the study of sterile problems, such as "Is transiency instinctive?" or else that the findings of sociologists may be buried in the dust of library shelves. In either case the spinning of theories and the collecting of facts would be little more than an interesting game for academicians.

Medina Echavarria prefers to take the risks involved in dealing with practical issues. (R 65). Without himself following this advice, he recommends a merging of theory and practice. He suggests that the needs of daily life may start sociologists to work on fundamental scientific problems as well as provide a testing ground for general hypotheses. Moreover, if they do not put their sociological skills and findings to work on vital problems of the day, they may not long have a chance to play with their scientific toys. These are not the words of Medina Echavarria, but I think they convey his ideas. (R Chap 3).

This brings us at last to the question of values. Shall sociologists concern themselves only with what is and how it came to be, or with what ought to be? This is the most bitterly contested of all and the last word has by no means been said. However, part of the trouble lies in a misconception of the problem. It is not a question of whether scholars may stand for values, but whether the tasks of science and ethics can be more fruitfully performed together or separately.

Some hold that the sociologist properly, if not inevitably, is concerned simultaneously with—let us say—the family as a natural phenomenon and the family as a moral value. Some consider the sociologist as a coward or a scoundrel, if he does not assume and preach the superiority of certain domestic patterns over others. Likewise with political, economic, artistic, religious, and other patterns.

Others maintain that no matter what his personal preferences may be,

the sociologist will fail to understand any social phenomena, unless he can at least temporarily and in part view them all objectively, without prejudice.

Medina Echavarria rather inclines to the latter view, although he does not share it completely. (T 28). He thinks the problem more complicated than it first appears. To begin with, science is itself a value. The student of sociology must attach some value to his subject or he would not bother to pursue it. In the second place, when he deals with a live issue only in terms of "pros" and "cons," declining to take any stand himself, he is not so much objective as irresponsible. (R 20). Ideally the sociologist ought to give answers to practical questions and advise what ought to be done. But in the present undeveloped state of his subject, he cannot perform this service adequately. (T 74) This seems to me to represent the position of Medina Echavarria. However, I am not sure that he is consistent.

In several places he speaks of science, including sociology, as a-moral. (T 27, R53-54) Its function is described as that of determining the nature of social phenomena, their interrelations, trends, and alternatives. This may include the study of values themselves, whence they come and their practical implications. If he accomplishes all this, the sociologist will have rendered valuable service not only to the building of a science, but also in the world of every day affairs.

For example—and the example is mine; not Medina's—suppose that a sociologist should demonstrate convincingly that city slums develop and continue as part of a given complex of customs, laws, and values. Suppose he showed that a part of this complex includes the current, approved practices of the real estate business and the building trades. Suppose he pointed out that slums could be abolished only by changing some of these manifestations of "free enterprise." He would then have helped citizens and administrators to face the situation realistically, for he would have displayed the practical alternatives and their implications. He would not have dictated the final choice, but he would have contributed to the possibility of its being made intelligently. Moreover, he himself might, *as citizen*, elect to support one of the alternatives. This is the position that Jose Medina Echavarria approaches, but does not quite adopt.

I have found the reading of his three books a stimulating experience. He has forced me to review many assumptions and conclusions which needed to be revised. His critique of North American sociology is particularly challenging. (C Chap 6) I hope that many of my colleagues may benefit from studying the works of this brilliant Spaniard.

*Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri.*

## NOTES OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST:

March 26, 1948: Ten Years Old

ON Saturday morning March 26, 1938 at Loyola University's North Side Campus, a small group of unorganized but hopeful Catholic sociologists convened. They were present because of a letter recently received by their schools. The letter, dated February 21, 1938 reads in part;

for some years there has been felt the need of concerted action on the part of our Catholic institutions of higher learning in the field of social thought and action. At the convention of the American Sociological Society this past December, a few representatives of Catholic colleges of the Middle West expressed the wish that a meeting of some kind be held, and they prevailed upon the representative of Loyola University to call such a meeting. So with the heartfelt approval and welcome of the Reverend President of Loyola, I am asking you to send a representative of your Sociology or Social Science department to this meeting.

The letter was signed, "Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J."

Father Gallagher's letter which was sent to all Catholic Colleges of the Middle West, went on to say that the purpose of the meeting was to consider the feasibility of forming a Mid-west Conference of Catholic Sociologists.

At that organizational meeting held just ten years ago this month, was born the American Catholic Sociological Society. Attending the meeting were about 35 persons from 30 Universities and Colleges, representing 9 States and a total of 20

cities. But since that day of its birth, the Society has grown with its years. As a comparison, this year at the Ninth Annual Convention there was a registration of 208 persons, representing 93 Institutions of which 55 were Universities and Colleges, 16 were High Schools and Academies, 22 were other institutions related to the field of Sociology; there were 22 States represented and 59 cities; there were also representatives present from Canada, British West Indies, and France. At previous conventions the number of registrations has been greater. The conventions held in Cleveland and Chicago have averaged between 250 and 300 registrations for the public meetings. However this is the first time in the history of the Society that so many States have been represented.

With so many people,<sup>1</sup> from that many institutions, dispersed over 22 States attending the Ninth Annual Convention of The American Catholic Sociological Society, the belief of the Society's founder Father Ralph A. Gallagher, S.J., that "there is need of such a conference and the results and benefits will be felt within our own schools, and in the academic world about us," has indeed proved correct.

RICHARD ROSENFELDER, S.J.

*Loyola University  
Chicago 11, Ill.*

<sup>1</sup> The membership of the American Catholic Sociological Society today numbers 369 individuals and institutions, compared to the 93 members at the end of 1938.



## NEWS OF SOCIOLOGICAL INTEREST

The business meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society was held during the annual convention in St. Louis, January 30—February, 1, 1948.

Franz Mueller of the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota was elected president. Other officers for 1948 are listed on page two of this issue.

The following is a financial statement for 1947:

*Income:*

from dues and subscriptions .....\$2503.91

*Expenses:*

Deficit, 12/20/46 .....	111.48
Book Review editor .....	35.77
Postage .....	275.26
Printing .....	1312.90
Clerical .....	525.00
Travel .....	25.00
Miscel. ....	28.84

\$2314.25

Balance: 1/12/48 ..... 189.66

Recent issues of the *Review*, including this one, have been delayed for several weeks because of printing difficulties and because the Society has had to find a new printer. The Mission Press, directed by the Fathers of the Divine Word at Techny, Illinois, have for the last eight years been printing the *Review* at great inconvenience to themselves and for the Society's benefit and convenience. This year the Press, with many regrets, informed us that it could no longer provide the service it had so graciously given us in the past.

Among the various resolutions adopted at the convention were the following:

"... approval of and sympathy with the action of Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter of St. Louis on... the elimination of educational 'Jim Crowism' in his diocese."

"... the standing committee on Inter-American cooperation be commissioned to expand its program and to formulate plans for further and greater cooperation both in respect to countries and projects."

"... special study be made the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education in a democracy and that such action be taken as is dictated by the implications of the sociological aspects of the report."

"... go on record as favoring a federal bill permitting the admission of larger numbers of displaced persons from certain war-devastated countries of Europe than present immigration quotas allow."

A suggestion by Alphonse H. Clemens for the amalgamation of the ACSS with the Catholic Economics Association was referred to the incoming Executive Council.

Reports were given on active local chapters in Cleveland and Philadelphia.

*University of Dayton:* Edward A. Huth, chairman of the department of sociology, will be on leave during the summer of 1948 to serve as guest professor of sociology at the University of San Francisco. Dr. Huth will offer courses in urban

sociology and juvenile delinquency.

*Regis College* (Weston, Mass.): The department of sociology is again offering a series of bi-weekly lectures on "Social Welfare." Community leaders from neighborhood houses, youth agencies, training schools, and Negro social agencies give the lectures.

*University of Southern California*: The third annual workshop in Intercultural Education will be held here June 21 to July 30. The program will provide (1) guidance and practice in planning active pro-

grams for improving intergroup relations in schools and communities. (2) opportunities to develop needed materials; (3) contacts with community leaders in health, housing, education, police protection, recreation and in minority groups, religious groups and other organizations and agencies; (4) contacts with consultants in sociology, psychology, anthropology, social work, and education.

For further information and applications address Mrs. Jane Hood, University of Southern California, Los Angeles 7, Calif.

## COMMUNICATIONS

## Controversial Issues

To the editor:

At the Business Session of the Ninth Annual Meeting of the American Catholic Sociological Society, held in St. Louis, Mo. on Jan. 30th, 31st, and Feb. 1st. a vital and interesting point was brought to the attention of the attending members. Proposals on public issues were set before the assembled body by Sr. M. Liguori, B.V.M. and Br. Gerald Schnepf, S.M. A lively discussion followed in which Edward Marciniak, Paul Hanly Furfey and Joseph H. Fichter, S. J. participated as leaders, and in which they expressed opinions on whether the ACSS should take a stand on any controversial issue of a local, state or national nature. Judging from the silent responses of the majority present and from the final vote on the proposition, the Society seemed to feel that it should not express its position on issues of a controversial character.

It is my considered judgment that such a major issue cannot and should not be resolved in so simple and rapid a fashion. This judgment was strengthened by the discussions among the various groups of members that followed the meeting. These discussions revealed not a consensus of opinion but rather a wide divergence.

In order to throw some light on the matter, especially for those not present at the Ninth Annual Meeting, it will be necessary to review the situation from both sides.

Many of those who favor the position that the ACSS should not take a stand on controversial issues point to the fact that the body of the ACSS is constituted of scientific men and women whose primary, if not sole, task is to unearth, assemble, and analyze facts of a sociological nature, without any reference to principles outside of those of a sociological character. Others claim that sociology is not a reformatory or a normative science; that the Society has no right to commit itself on any issue which might involve it and its members in the non-scientific procedure of making controversial value-judgments of a non-sociological nature which might be based on sociological or pseudo-sociological data. Furthermore, they claim, that this would involve us in the petty squabbles, jealousies and bickerings so characteristic of sectarianism and that it would detract considerably from our nature as social scientists. Finally, they state, no similar scientific body had made it a policy to express itself on controversial issues such as are under consideration here.

The other side marshals its arguments in a fashion similar to this: Value judgments are a legitimate tool in sociology; they, therefore, can be extended beyond sociology by a sociologist if he bases them on reliable sociological data. Willynily, "Catholic Sociology" is, they assert, not only a reformatory science but also a normative science. Admittedly, this has been questioned

before and will be questioned in the future. Furthermore, they continue, the position of a Catholic Sociologist is unlike that of a member of the American Sociological Society. The Catholic Sociologist views his subject matter and his formal object from a somewhat more evaluative and purposeful angle. He does not claim that he is not influenced or guided by the philosophical principles and concepts of dogma embodied in the Catholic Church. Lastly, he points out the fact that divorce, euthanasia, sterilization, birth control are very controversial in the United States; and this being true, he could not or should not, in the light of the other side's arguments, take a stand on these questions. Yet as a Catholic he cannot but express himself strongly and vehemently against these practices.

I tis not my intention to take any

side at this time. However, I do believe that it is highly important and, in fact, imperative that the ACSS take a stand one way or the other on the proposition of whether it should or should not take sides in so-called controversial issues.

I, therefore, propose that at the next annual meeting of the ACSS this question be put before the assembled members and delegates and that they be notified in advance of the question. Let the members decide, after full deliberation, whether or not the Society shall be empowered to present and offer controversial proposals to its members who can then decide whether or not they will accept or refuse to take a stand on each proposal as it is given.

CLEMENT S. MIHANOVICH

*St. Louis University,  
St. Louis, Mo.*

## BOOK REVIEWS

Editor:

EVA J. ROSS, *Trinity College, Washington 17, D. C.*

*An Introductory Study of the Family.* Revised edition, by Edgar Schmiedeler, O.S.B. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc., 1947. Pp. xii+460. \$3.00.

*The Contemporary American Family.* Rewritten and reset edition. By Ernest R. Groves and Gladys Hoagland Groves. Chicago and Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1947. Pp. xii+838. \$4.50.

The recent publication of revised editions of these two widely accepted texts in the field of family sociology provides an unique opportunity for something more than the usual exposition of organization and materials in terms of the reviewer's prejudices. Insofar as they both can be viewed as more rather than less typical of divergent schools of thought in this field, their present revised form serves as an index of developments and changes which have been respectively accepted or rejected.

Fr. Schmiedeler's revision of his 1930 edition of *An Introductory Study of the Family* "both in broad outline and in substance . . . remains much the same as in its original form" p. v. As in the earlier edition of seventeen years ago, his conception of sociology includes ethics, philosophy, and, for that matter, theology. On this score, his position, however laudable in its final purpose, is clearly out of step with contemporary thinking in many Catholic circles. It explains, too, both the book's emphasis on normative considerations and the paucity of materials drawn from recent contributions of cultural anthropology, social psychology and empiric sociology. For those who share Fr. Schmiedeler's sociological disposition, both the organization of the study and its materials highly recommend it. Thus, Part I establishes the medieval Christian family as the model of Family Organization; Part II refers the present state of Family Disorganization to the modern industrial and ideological revolutions; and Part III recommends practical as well as moral and religious steps which will result in Family Reintegration. It may be regretted, however, that even within this framework, changes from the earlier edition are only found in some aspects of internal organization and in the inclusion of more recent papal and episcopal messages. As one might expect, the very size of Fr. Schmiedeler's sociological net makes for a looseness in his handling of concepts and data which will evoke the dismay of those (including the reviewer) who, however narrow their concept of sociology, esteem accuracy and precision. Thus, quite apart from the dated character of most of the references and the neglect of recent descriptive and monographic studies, one notes the ambiguous application of the concepts *race* and *racial bonds* to immigrants independent of any taxonomic, genetic or physiological distinction (p. 74). Again, while inveighing against the urban influences on family life, Fr. Schmiedeler, without explanation,

statistically lumps together the 1940 Census data on housing characteristics for urban and rural non-farm units and ascribes the cumulative deficiencies to urban areas (Pp. 136-7). A comparison of his data with a breakdown according to the Census classification reveals an appreciable distortion of the real situation.

In sum, the revised edition, however practical and useful on some levels represents little improvement over its predecessor. It will, nonetheless, find favor among those disposed to accept its premises and purposes.

*The Contemporary American Family* by the late Ernest R. Groves and his wife, Gladys Hoagland Groves is a completely rewritten and reset edition of their 1934 publication, *The American Family*, and reflects very clearly the interim developments in sociological thinking in this field. Designed practically "to give the reader an understanding of American family life that will help him handle his own problems whether they are associated with pre-marriage, marriage, or parenthood experiences" (p. vii), the Groves' study is divided into four parts which respectively deal with the historical background and development of the American family as a social institution (Part I), the psychological aspects of American family experiences (Part II), the social problems associated with contemporary family life (Part III), and a description of specialized program which have been advanced for the conservation of the American family (Part IV). This organization provides the authors with a framework particularly suited to the inclusion of significant recent contributions from psychology, cultural anthropology and empiric sociology. Of these the importance of the psychological aspects of family life receives an attention which, while it is in keeping with their importance, reflects the relative immaturity of that discipline.

More generally satisfactory are the historical descriptions of the background of the American family in the ancient, medieval and modern worlds and the analysis of social problems present to contemporary family life. Unfortunately, as with most other studies in this field, this latter treatment so emphasizes the role of situational factors as to result in a segmental analysis. The significant implications of the structure of the American family for the behaviour of its members and for their vulnerability to the influence of situational forces is only indirectly appreciated, however effectively it would have served to integrate the analysis. The authors do, however, appreciate the magnitude of the problems which face the family and in their final section describe the various legal, biologic, and medical approaches directed to their solution. Catholics will here note the disposition of the Groves' to approve birth control, divorce, and sterilization, but this inclination is generally subordinated to the descriptive, scientific task which they had set for themselves. It can be predicted that this revision, so well supplemented with literary and bibliographic appendices, will find wide acceptance and will remain as a scholarly memorial to the pioneer work of Professor Groves in the field of marriage and the family.

JOHN D. DONOVAN

Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y.

*Marriage and the Family.* By Meyer F. Nimkoff. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. Pp. xx+767. \$5.

In the editor's introduction, professor William Ogburn informs us that this is a new book and more than just a revision of an older work by the author. This is true. We even have a new title. Again Dr. Nimkoff sets the pace with the type of text that we need. As his first book, *The Family*, so this is an example of fine workmanship. Figures, plates, and tables abound. Each chapter has its Question for Discussion, Topics for Reports, and Selected Readings. The author and publishers should be congratulated. This is a good text book for both teacher and student. It is just too bad that the content or subject matter is not on a par with the format, techniques, and usability of the text. Dr. Nimkoff does make a great effort to be both objective and fair. Perhaps we should not blame the author as much as his philosophy. In general the book is the product of the secular viewpoint, and so the moral and religious issues are not truly valued. Our American authors on the family seems to be conspiring against the women of the Colonial Period. I think she was better off than our so-called liberated women of today. She at least was held in respect. The author expresses a vain hope that the Catholic Church will change its attitude and its doctrine on birth control. Yes, it is a vain hope.

The evolutionary development of the family takes up an important part of the first section. The conclusions stated forget that social evolution is still in the realm of theory. The author seems at his best in the analysis of the the family today. His chapters on "The Family and Social Change" are his best.

To Dr. Nimkoff and the publishers, we owe a vote of thanks for a fine text. May it inspire some member of the American Catholic Sociological Society to turn out a similar text founded upon our philosophy and written with the realization that the state of marriage is a sacramental state and that the institution of the family is a divine foundation.

RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J.

Loyola University, Chicago 26, Ill.

*The Family in American Culture.* By Andrew G. Truxal and Francis E. Merrill. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947. Pp. xii+780. \$5.65.

This book is definitely a contribution to the literature on the family and therein, perhaps, lies its greatest fault. It more than covers the topic. The authors have assumed too great a task. They do not presume to be authorities in many fields but still without fear they pass judgment in the fields of economics, morality, and religion. The work is the product of gigantic effort and is more than a "ridiculus mus." But its turn out to be a rather diffuse encyclopedia.

The work is divided into four parts. In the first part "The Family in the America Pattern" is treated. Perhaps the title of the division is confusing and the reader is too hopeful of something original on the American family. He will be disappointed. In this section of the work the authors venture into an interpretation of St. Paul and the Fathers on



"women." This is just a small example of their naive approach. The work is definitely from the secularist point of view and, therefore, in the evaluation of religious and moral principles and practices, it is found wanting. In the second and third sections the authors are more at home as sociologists. The family as an institution is defended. There is more objective writing and the reader is brought up-to-date with some fine descriptive charts and statistics. In the fourth and last part under the title, "The Family and Social Change," the total disintegration of the modern family is treated. A final plan of reorganization and a hopeful wish for the future take up the last two chapters.

This is a good reference book. The historical, statistical, and objective materials are well handled. On moral and religious questions there is great confusion and here the secularist philosophy of the authors shows itself. There is an effort to understand the Catholic approach, but it is only an effort. The authors planned the work for the class room but it is too diffuse. Great pains have been taken in the references and each chapter concludes with a select bibliography. A fine two-fold index is attached. Certainly the authors deserve credit and the publishers can be proud of their product.

RALPH A. GALLAGHER, S.J.

Loyola University, Chicago 26, Ill.

*Understanding Society: The Principles of Dynamic Sociology.* By Howard W. Odum. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. 749. \$5.00

This volume is intended to serve as a general text for either introductory or advanced classes. It seems likely, however, that it will be used chiefly by teachers in the field who are interested in knowing what the author thinks about men, books, events and trends within the sixty years that have passed since Ward published his *Dynamic Sociology*.

Many readers of the Review will find the use of terms confusing and the attempt to salvage concepts of value from the mass of writings by materialistic monists irritating. It is clear that the author "tries his level best to look at the life about him with as much objectivity as possible." (p. 31) This is desirable so far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. "There is nothing more useful than to look at the world as it really is and at the same time look elsewhere for a remedy for its trouble." (*Rerum Novarum*)

The purpose of society, as defined by the author, is the seeking of balance between people and resources and institutions; sociology has a greater opportunity than ever before "to contribute a universal folk morale, by which is meant not only a clear understanding of society, but the will to participate in the processes of living and to work for survival and progress." (p. 33) The author may very rightly be troubled about the prospect of developing this *morale* to control the technic ways that have destroyed the once powerful mores (which sometimes developed into morals) and have nullified the stateways among which are included the "Methodist Discipline" and the papal encyclicals. (pp. 39, 168, 227, 366).

The profuse illustrations printed on unglossed paper are clear, there

is a wealth of interesting maps and tables. In fact much of "The Library and Workshop" section which follows the chapters contains teaching devices, annotated references and questions which bear mute testimony to the esteem in which the author is held by his students and of his own indefatigable zeal and rich teaching experience. This section is not unlike the similarly named department in *Social Forces*, the quarterly Dr. Odum founded a quarter of a century ago and which seems to be increasing in usefulness as the years pass.

SISTER MARY HENRY. O. P.

*Rosary College, River Forest, Illinois.*

*Sociology of Film; Studies and Documents.* By J. P. Mayer. London: Faber and Faber, 1946. Pp. 328. 15 shillings.

In deference to the author's prefatory remark, to the effect that this book ought to have been called "*Matériaux pour une sociologie du film*," readers may properly withhold criticism of its lack of comprehensiveness and systematic theoretical development. They will find it interesting enough to have an account of the research project and to read the statements of film audience reactions reprinted in entirety. Apparently Mayer, a student of European political parties (*Max Weber and German Politics, Political Thought in France*), became interested in the impact of the movies upon opinion, and, after an introduction to J. Arthur Rank, proceeded with the latter's aid to investigate popular responses to screen productions. After a little more than a year (1944-45), this partnership was dissolved—peaceably, and with acknowledgements of indebtedness to the film magnate—and Mayer continued his studies independently. This volume follows one by Margaret Farrand Thorp, *America at the Movies*, and will be followed in turn by at least two other reports of the English research.

Three sketchy but suggestive introductory chapters reveal some of the author's theoretical sources and interpretations of history. On the premise that "dramatic art is the self-interpretation of mature societies" (p. 31), the contemporary cinema is compared with Greek, Roman, and Elizabethan theatrical art, in order that its social function may be more surely assessed. In these earlier periods, as long as the state had an organic (not necessarily democratic) form universal audiences were attracted to the theater where they participated in a unifying experience. When this quality declined in the state, the crowds became atomized, the theater class-oriented, and the masses obedient spectators satisfied by *panem at circenses*. It is the same today: "Just because the traditional structures of life are uprooted and are on the verge of disappearing altogether, the modern cinemagoer is seeking a *participation mystique* in the events of the screen" (p. 19). This thesis is illustrated by observations from the children's cinema clubs in Great Britain, the American Payne Fund studies, and the examination of fully-reproduced documents submitted by children, adolescents, and adults, at the author's request. What are the value patterns implicit in the film lives with which modern audiences seek identification? What of the many who avow that what they have seen has helped them to discover their own "personalities," when all they have learned is to fashion themselves after a type, a "moving shadow," in Max Beerbohm's

phrase? We are being drugged, Mayer maintains. His frank concern with the moral effects of the movies, especially upon children, is in refreshing contrast to the evasiveness of many American sociologists on the issue. The pleas for state-operated movie-houses for children, and state regulation and censorship of other films, too, will have to be considered within the context of British national life. Taken as the introductory effort its author intended it to be, this book is stimulating, sufficiently so, it may be hoped, to prompt a more rounded presentation of the sociology of the movies.

C. J. NUESSE

*The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D.C.*

*The School in the American Social Order.* By Newton Edwards and Herman G. Rickey. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947. Pp. xiv+880. \$5.

By combining an analysis of the relationship between school and society with a definitive history of the development of the social order in the United States, the authors have produced a work of dual usefulness. This book should be read as much as possible in one piece, so to speak, in order that the full sweep of this double aspect can be clearly grasped and adequately evaluated.

The main idea developed in this study, that the freedom and democracy of American education were not the gift of the founding fathers but resulted from a combination of social forces present in pioneer life, is similar to the theme of du Nouy's book, published also in 1947, that freedom is the goal of all developmental processes of human life. Carl Becker's claim that Jeffersonian equalitarianism resulted not from a study of Locke but from ideas current if not common to thinking Americans of that period is also in essential agreement with this idea.

The class structure of Europe was brought to the new world by the colonists, and as democracy was despised and distrusted for Church and Commonwealth so likewise was it suspect as an aim of education. It is true that each settler hoped to better his condition but few came with the conscious intent of founding a democratic social order. In fact the Dutch Patroons of New York, the Lords Proprietors in the Carolinas and the Calverts in Maryland attempted to set up systems that were a throwback toward feudalism. The compulsory education statutes of 1642 and 1647 resulted as much from a desire to prevent, by educating every boy for some trade or calling, the conditions that made the seventeenth century poor laws of England necessary, as from the Puritan mandate that all should be literate in order to read the Bible.

By the end of the 18th Century this European class structure had weakened somewhat in the face of the rapid development of an independent yeomanry. For some time people had resisted attempts to prevent social mobility. The blows of Roger Williams and Thomas Hooker were powerful in opening the way to democratic liberalism. Wide diffusion of land ownership gave vigor and vitality to this democratic impulse which was felt also in the realm of education. The establishment of homes in the wilderness had led men to become engrossed in the essential business of

making a living and they soon slipped from the hardy virtues of Puritanism into materialism which led easily to capitalism for which the stage had been set by the industrial revolution.

Extracts from colonial statutes and charters make the whole of section one fresh and delightful even though it is a little repetitious at times. The chapter on new social dynamics handles the population problem so masterfully that it could well be published as a separate monograph. The understanding not only of the traditional economic laws and principles but also of the newer economy of plenty and the finance of spending, that is shown in the three chapters on economics, is tremendous in extent and clarity of presentation. The objectivity and thorough documentation throughout the book inspires confidence in the uprightness and scholarly integrity of the authors.

Because a laissez-faire society believes that the economic system can be trusted to right itself through the automatic operation of economic laws, there is little need to cultivate powers of critical social analysis in or out of school. But with the passing of the laissez-faire philosophy together with the loss of confidence in automatic controls, and the social dislocations of the technicological revolution, a great challenge of a new type is given to education. In this age, educators can no longer follow social forces, they must go ahead in developing a social technology with its reliance on social design. The schools must show the way by training youth in moral courage, strength of will, and the social insight necessary to resolve the conflicts and to cooperate in producing "the design of a more just and humane society."

DOROTHY M. PARTON, R.S.C.J.

*Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, N. Y. 27, N. Y.*

*Educational Sociology.* By Francis J. Brown. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947. Pp. xiv+626. \$5.35.

Dr. Brown had been connected with the Department of Educational Sociology at New York for ten years before serving in his present capacity as staff associate in the American Council on Education. During these last years he has been in constant contact with agencies in and out of the government and has been witness to the interplay of diverse interests and social forces. He has been an ardent disciple of Dr. E. George Payne, now Dean Emeritus of the School of Education, New York University. He calls the latter the "father of educational sociology." His own thinking has been heavily influenced by Payne.

There are two major approaches to the subject of educational sociology. One group takes its point of departure in education and applies social emphasis to the school programs. Brown stands rather with that group which looks upon education as a fertile field for applied sociology. Educational sociology is neither sociology alone nor education alone but "joins them in a new science by applying sociological principles to the whole process of education, including subject matter and activities, method, school organization, and measurement." (p. 35)

Brown's concept of the nature of educational sociology may be summed

up in two key words—interaction and social control—two processes which he makes interchangeable at least in the definitions he gives of this discipline. He defines educational sociology as “the study of the interaction of the individual and his cultural environment, which includes other individuals, social groups, and patterns of behaviour.” (p. 33). A short time later he states that it “is concerned with problems of personality or behavior as determined by culture. In a phrase, it may be defined as the science of social control.” (p. 38). “The process of social interaction provides the subject matter of educational sociology.” (p. 35). Social interaction is the process of interstimulation between individual and group and causes modification of behavior in the participants. (p. 139). Social control, on the other hand, is “the sum total of processes whereby society, or any sub-group within society, secures conformity to expectation on the part of its constituent units, individuals, or groups.” (p. 558). It might help matters a great deal if there were some clarification as to whether educational sociology is the science of social interaction or of social control. Presumably the author wishes it to be both.

Educational sociology is not only concerned with the school, the specific educational agency but with other agencies and cultural patterns as well; however, it does not occupy itself with those aspects which do not condition personality development. Unlike educational psychology, which treats of the method of acquisition and organization of experience, educational sociology seeks to determine the effect of learning upon group life and to explain how education may “under optimum conditions, eliminate social defects, perpetuate desirable institutions, group forms and practices, and attain for society the ideals and standards it aims to achieve” (p. 38).

Through the process of interaction the individual becomes a person; his human nature is socially acquired. “Personality is the person’s concept of his role in social groups. This concept determines his behavior within the group.” (p. 137). We would hardly expect Dr. Brown to make the neat distinctions which scholastic philosophers make with regard to human nature and person or personality.

What is education then? “It is a consciously controlled process whereby changes in behavior are produced in the person and through the person within the group” (p. 165); it involves changes in behavior regardless of whether these are desirable or not (p. 167); it is that which makes for more effective participation in the total process of social interaction whether in terms of social, economic, health, or any other socially desirable human value . . . in its highest sense, education has taken place when external controls have been accepted as convictions by the person and have become internal controls. (p. 168).

One of the basic problems of sociology, according to Brown, is to determine the role of the school and other educational agencies in the social adjustment of the individual to the cultural milieu. (p. 163). The school must achieve two seemingly antagonistic ends; transmission of the cultural heritage essential to the perpetuation and well-being of society and the development of the individual’s personality. This individual must not be “a blind conformist bound by the weight of tradition, but a person—free and possessed of knowledge to dream and think and plan for a better

world." (*ibid.*). The school curriculum is taken in a very broad sense as the total situation or group of situations to make behavior changes in youth to be educated. (p. 308). These situations must be directed to predetermined goals such as health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home-membership, vocation, citizenship, exercise of the right to the pursuit of human happiness, use of leisure, ability to think rationally, appreciation of ethical values. Education is conceived as the major instrument or the agency of social control; the curriculum, in its turn, is regarded as the basic instrument of the educative process. (p. 309).

Naturally then more space will be devoted to consideration of the school which is the formal agency of education. The school is expected to direct the social processes and provide for a creative role in personality development. (p. 244). Hence the school is considered in its relation to culture, to the development of the in-group, to the curriculum, and to the community. The family also occupies an important place as one of the active agencies of education. Other active agencies treated are the Church, recreational agencies, and the library. The passive agencies briefly considered are the motion picture, the radio, and press.

Unfortunately, Dr. Brown takes the same position as most secular sociologists with regard to the ethical basis of behavior. Following Sumner he holds that "folkways and mores (including attitudes) determine right and wrong." (p. 559). In referring to coercive social control through law, he says that "legislation to be effective must grow out of, and conform to, the accepted folkways and mores of the majority of the dominant group—in a democracy, this, presumably, is 'all the people'". A little observation will bring home to what extent even a majority can be influenced in their thinking and acting by a small minority. Does the resultant behavior become rights? This seems to be the application of the old adage that "forty million Frenchmen can't be wrong."

Brown is cognizant of the difference between authoritarian and democratic control and notes how the acceptance of one or the other permeates every aspect of human relationships. (p. 566). Yet he seems to rejoice in the loss of the Church's influence in the informal and formal agencies of education and the reestablishment of the State as "the supreme organ of society." (p. 170). What does this lead to if not to authoritarianism and totalitarianism, if no higher authority of any kind is recognized.

Dr. Brown does not seem to have a very high regard for religion and the Church (whatever that is). Religion, he says, appeals to the emotions rather than to the intellect (p. 252); it is, at one and the same time, integrating and divisive. (p. 383). Few institutions are as resistant to the impact of social change in folkways, mores, and attitudes, as is the Church. (p. 384). I wonder what he means when he sees science "discovering a new heaven and creating a new earth" (p. 374) and tomorrow's school creating "the new heaven and the new earth of the world of tomorrow." (p. 580). If educational sociology is devoted to assisting in the achievement of this end, then it must have a concept of fundamental values and fundamental relationships.



An extensive and helpful bibliography of some thirty pages completes the volume.

FRANCIS J. FRIEDEL, S.M.

Trinity High School, Sioux City, Iowa.

*The American Farmer: His Problems and His Prospects.* By Lee Fryer. New York: Harper and Bros., 1947. Pp. X+172. \$3.

Mr. Fryer should have called this book *The Low-Income Farmer*, because it is concerned almost exclusively with the lower two-thirds of farmers who market only twenty percent of the farm products and receive only that proportion of the gross agricultural income. The reader is carried in spirit back to the bleak and experimental 'thirties when he reads that two million farm families in 1945 received a net income of less than \$500, and that one million have moved out of this bracket only because of the war boom; that draft boards rejected over one-half of the boys from farm homes for reasons of health; that 83 percent of the 3,800,000 houses used by share-croppers, et al., are unfit for human use; and so on.

All this is in sharp contrast to the prosperous, electrically lighted, tractor-powered farms pictured in magazines, and serves as a check rein on those who extol the glories of rural life without qualification. It is also in sharp contrast with the farm news which makes the headlines in times like the present—a 1947 cash income of \$30 billion, twenty percent above the previous high of 1946, a reduction of nearly \$2 billions in the farm mortgage debt since 1940, and an increase in farm savings from \$4.2 billions in 1940 to \$20.5 in 1947.

The entire book is an example of depression thinking. Mr. Fryer takes for granted that the present high level of industrial activity and farm prosperity is just an interlude in a prolonged depression, and pictures the historians of the future shaking their heads in amazement over our "terrible employment problem in the 1950's."

Although the author gives no reasons to support his assumption that we shall soon resume the great depression where we left off in 1939, his instinctive fears will probably be verified, at least in regard to agriculture; and in any case one-third to one-half of the farm people are living below the danger line, depression or no depression. The question then is what to do about it; and the great part of the book consists of a second-rate discussion of the standard proposals for improving the status of low-income farm families.

The author does not describe how farmers and agricultural leaders can reduce these plans to action and confines himself for the most part to predicting rough going if they fail to do so.

MARTIN E. SCHIRBER, O.S.B.

St. John's University, Collegeville, Minn.



*Workmen's Compensation Insurance: Monopoly Or Free Competition?*  
By Frank Lang. Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, 1947. Pp. xiv+239. \$4.

The promotion of the common welfare, the protection of individual rights, and the stimulation of opportunities for increasingly better standards of living for all, particularly for the less fortunate elements of society, are the prerogative and duty of the State. Nonetheless, it does not constitute an excuse for the State to monopolize all business enterprises of social significance. Once the social goals have been set by society, private enterprise may very well be much more efficient in the mechanics of achieving these goals. It could be that private insurance companies are better equipped to handle workmen's compensation insurance than monopolistic state funds. This, at least, in the impression given by Mr. Lang's book.

The author has carefully studied the files of the sixty-six stock casualty company, members of the Association of Casualty and Surety Executives, as well as those of other large insurance companies throughout the country. He gives an adequate and factual (with graphs and statistics) picture of their activities in every phase of workmen's compensation insurance—claim, legal, medical and rehabilitation, safety engineering, and production service. The analysis of the work of the monopolistic state funds seems less thorough though the author claims that "all published material available in annual reports, rate manuals, audits and authoritative sources" (p. vi) as well as questionnaires and interviews were carefully studied. He, however, honestly warns his readers against a too minute comparison between the two systems, because of the great diversity of methods in the state funds and the difficulty of obtaining adequate data. Nevertheless, the inference is unmistakable that private enterprise in this instance is far superior in quality, efficiency, and economy to monopolistic state funds.

The book is worthwhile as a reference source of statistical information available on the topic. It is not pleasurable reading, but two chapters, III and IV, "Medical and Rehabilitation Services" and "Industrial Accident Prevention" are excellent little treatises on what has been done in this line. The book would be particularly enlightening to employers who seek a better appreciation of the value of workmen's compensation insurance.

EDWARD J. GELINEAU

*St. Francis Xavier, Winooski, Vt.*

*Fundamentals of Labor Economics.* By Friedrich Baerwald. New York. Declan X. McMullen Co., 1947. Pg. xxx 464. \$4.

This is, as far as the reviewer knows, the first textbook on labor economics written by a Catholic in the United States. It is a fortunate beginning. Future Catholic writers in the field may well have reason to rejoice that the beginning was made by a man with a European background.

Dr. Baerwald is able to see that many of the current objectives of labor in the United States are in line with the traditions of democratic

countries in Europe. He handles many sharply contested issues with vision and clarity and discounts the irrational emotionality that has surrounded such proposed extensions of social justice as public housing projects for low income families, health insurance, family allowances, social security for all workers including agricultural and domestic workers and those employed by non-profit institutions.

He is able to establish a distinction between an international organization of labor unions and the communist-inspired Socialist Unity parties common in Europe. And thus he judges that participation in the World Federation of Trade Union "does not of itself imply the surrender of democratic principles or procedure."

All in all the book should be a help to teachers of undergraduate economics. It surveys the organization of modern industrial life, economic theory, social and labor legislation (including the Taft-Hartley bill), and some of the highlights in the history of American trade unionism. The author discusses full employment, the closed shop, and various relief systems.

There are deficiencies in format and style. A printed work should do more than record lectures; it should be an aid to the eye and serviceable as a printed page, and should be relieved with a variety of type and illustrations. Moreover, the fact that the book does represent a comprehensive set of lecture notes probably explains its somewhat heavy, discursive style.

One curious omission in the bibliography is worthy of note. It is hard to see how the late Monsignor John A. Ryan could be omitted from even a professedly selective bibliography on labor economics in the United States.

DANIEL M. CANTWELL

*Catholic Labor Alliance, Chicago 11, Ill.*

*Principles and Practice of Social Work*, By Helen I. Clarke, New York: Appleton Century, 1947. Pp. 450. \$3.50

Very few authors have assumed the difficult task of presenting a general view of social service since its modern development. Fink's *The Field of Social Work* is the most recent attempt at such a broad view of the work but he stresses the sectional or divisional development and does not concern himself with the philosophical framework or the relationships of religion, sociology and psychology to social work.

Miss Clarke has compiled in this volume, material of outstanding significance. Her purpose is to introduce the beginning student in social service to a "bird's eye view" of the field. She hopes also to serve other interested persons in the community and doubtless this book will be of real value to teachers, board members, civic leaders and sociologists.

The book is divided into two main sections: the first deals with Social Work Practice as exemplified and defined by many outstanding practitioners in the field of case work, group work, social action, public welfare, and community organization. The reader is thus interested in the beginnings of modern professional practice through the writings and contributions of individual personalities: Jane Addams, Mary Richmond, Porter Lee,

Grace Coyle, S. R. S. Lavson, to mention only a few. The second half of the volume is devoted to a discussion of agencies and resources for children, youth, juvenile and adult offenders, health, medical care and mental illness and defectiveness.

Of special interest to many readers is the inclusion of the services and resources of racial groups, the contribution of various religious groups and the development and trends of social work as the author envisages them.

From the point of view of a text, this book will undoubtedly be greeted with an enthusiasm it deserves. Excellent bibliographies and discussion questions accompany each chapter and the setup of the book admits a variety of uses and presentations. Interesting case histories and examples in all the fields of social work clarify the author's summation of principles and analysis of trends.

The very variety and scope of the field of social work make any introductory volume a complex problem. Miss Clarke's clarity of presentation, scientific objectiveness and good judgment of selection make her book an unusually sound contribution. Another recommendation for this text is the skill with which the salient attitudes and thinking of well known social workers have been used in the clarification of growth and development in this new profession. Bearing in mind the purpose of this book which is the introduction to a diversified field of practice, persons interested in an unbiased and current picture of social work will want to include this book in their libraries.

JEAN F. HEWITT

Washington 2, D.C.

*Unto the Least of These: Social Service for Children.* By Emma Octavia Lundberg. New York: D. Appleton-Century Co., 1947 Pp. xi+424. \$3.75.

The title of this volume is significant in that it reveals the attitude of the author. A lifetime of study and research enriched with experience as an official of the Children's Bureau, as a consultant to the Child Welfare League of America and as a member of numberless committees and commissions on social welfare in general and child welfare specifically seems to have enhanced rather than dimmed Miss Lundberg's faith in "the Great Artificer" (p. 20) and His plan for His universe. This is refreshing at a time when many who should know better have accepted the notion that objective research can be accomplished only by those who have substitute science for religion.

Clarification of terms, forthright statement of purpose and gentle, but unmistakable humor smooth the reader's way to such an extent that anyone who wants to read a lively commentary on the development of child welfare services in the United States will enjoy this book. At the same time there is much in it to challenge the professional student and the child welfare worker. There is little doubt that a new classic has been published.

The early chapters build a careful background for the discussion of principles involved in the development of child welfare services throughout the years. The presentation is honest and critical as well as appreciative

and comprehensive. Short biographical sketches of twenty leaders known personally by the author serve to give a pattern of sequence and the co-operative endeavor that resulted from working contacts. The material on Monsignor Kerby is adequate and authentic. It is unfortunate that the tradition of anonymity obscures the leadership that must have existed in the various religious communities which served children. Miss Lundberg has utilized the sources available and is not responsible for the gaps that may never be filled. The only work that attempts to cover this field so far as the reviewer knows is Monsignor O'Grady's *Catholic Charities in the United States* published in 1931.

Very likely a discussion of child welfare services for Indian and for Negro children was omitted purposely. The emphasis was placed on dependency and on delinquency. The chapter in which the legal basis of social action is discussed is particularly valuable. The last chapter "The Road Leads Forward" attempts to summarize points that the author considers of vital significance at the present time and in future planning.

A classified and annotated reading list will be of particular value to readers who wish to discover references that Miss Lundberg considers basic; throughout the volume footnotes indicate a wealth of sources available for further use. The slender index is remarkably complete.

SISTER MARY HENRY, O. P.

Rosary College, River Forest, Ill.

*Readings in Social Psychology.* Edited by Theodore M. Newcomb and Eugene L. Hartley. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1947. Pp. xiv + 627. \$4.00

In an attempt to meet the needs of teachers and students for a representative sample of social psychological research, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues has sponsored, and its Committee on the Teaching of Social Psychology has supervised, the preparation of a substantial volume containing "an illustrative selection of empirical studies" (p. v) exemplifying "the ways in which the influence of social conditions upon psychological processes have been studied." (p. vii).

The result is a book which brings together some seventy-six selections, most of which are complete accounts of specific researches. The selections are organized under such conventional headings as The Socialization of the Child, The Influence of Social Conditions upon Memory, Judgment, Perception and Motivation, Uniformities and Variations under Differing Social Conditions, Language and Semantics, Suggestion, Imitation, Sympathy, Social Frustration and Aggression, Prejudice, Effects of Group Situations upon Behavior, Industrial Morale, Role and Status, Leadership, Social Class, Communication, Propaganda, Public Opinion and Crisis Situations. Individual selections range from Newman on "How Differences in Environment Affected Separated One-egg Twins" to "The Psychologist's Manifesto" on War and Peace.

The selections relate strictly to Social Psychology. Many courses and textbooks in this field include subject matter in related specialties

such as the physiological and psychological foundations of behavior and personality, measurement, and abnormal psychology. The work under review does not include readings in these areas. Furthermore, no attempt is made to represent the more generalized and speculative "armchair" social psychologies of the 19th and early 20th centuries. There is, however, a useful appendix explaining basic statistical terms. The growing ethnological contribution to an understanding of personality formation in different cultural settings is also represented in accounts by Mead, Benedict, Kardiner and Linton. All of the selections relate to work conducted in the past twenty years.

The editors have succeeded admirably in accomplishing their objective. They have assembled an extremely usable supplementary resource for any course in which social behavior is studied, whatever the theoretical approach may be. While some of the selections reflect moral relativism, on the whole the collection is free of the ethically objectionable assumptions and generalizations which permeate many of the formal texts and treatises available in social psychology. It is a welcome addition to the active shelf of references in the field.

JAMES J. BURNS

Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

*Hawaiian Americans: The Mingling of Japanese, Chinese, Polynesian and American Cultures.* By Edwin G. Burrows. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947. Pp. 228. \$3.00.

In this work we have another account of the exciting history of the impact of alien cultures upon Hawaiian natives and of the reaction of the islanders to both Occidental and Oriental immigrants. Mingling of diverse cultures in the Pacific reflects the course of modern history from the voyages of the eighteenth century to the air battles of the twentieth. In nineteenth century Hawaii were problems that concerned rulers: indifference to native religious practices, agitation of women for emancipation, and pressing economic and political issues. From the days of Captain Cook to the aftermath of World War II we note the growth of haole prestige among Hawaiians, Oriental immigrants and their children as well as the haoles themselves. From the haole dominance natives sought relief by the utilization of techniques of aggression, withdrawal in the forms of religious and recreative diversion, and cooperation.

With civilization came degeneration, with invention came materialism, with discovery came disease, with wealth came exploitation and stratification in favor of the haole. At the same time, however, Christianity enlightened pagan minds. The author says little of Catholic missionaries in Hawaii. He does stress the relatively good accomodation of heterogeneous groups and the consistent efforts to establish and maintain haole prestige.

Dr. Burrows states his points briefly and well, sometimes in the manner of one impatient with the vocabulary of precise scholars, sometimes with a tinge of journalistic color. For all Americans he presents a study

worthy of attention by way of understanding our national history and our future development.

MARGARET MARY TOOLE

*College of Notre Dame, Baltimore 10, Maryland.*

*An Approach to Social Medicine*, by John D. Kershaw, M.D. The Williams and Wilkins Co., Baltimore, 1946. Pp. 329. \$4.50.

The reader's first reaction to this book is to wonder if, by chance, the wrong material has been inserted between the book boards. Even the preface in which the author states: "the aim of this book is not to teach the reader social medicine but to show him where it lies and how it may be sought" (p. vii) does not prepare one for a book in which the only relationship between society and medicine lies in a form of allegory. The author make use of his medical knowledge in a very limited way and one questions, not the doctor's flights of fancy, but the scientific or serious nature of this book. Its main tenets are based on belief in the development of family life from group marriage, which most social anthropologists deny, and a naive assumption of the truth of Rousseau's social contract theory "as an accepted and acceptable fact." (p. 41).

Having stated his two points, the doctor spends the remainder of the book urging us to bring about a social development in keeping with our knowledge of medicine. This is particularly true biologically speaking where he advocates acceptance of extra-marital relations, artificial insemination, contraceptives, etc. (p. 269) The doctor's "brave, new world" is not going to be looked upon as original progressive social thinking by a vast number of people—probably because it is so replete with ancient heresies.

JEAN F. HEWITT

*Washington 2, D.C.*

# SHORT NOTICES

*The Development of Social Thought.* Revised Edition. By Emory S. Bogardus. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1947. Pp. x+574. \$4.00.

What is new in this revised edition is chiefly a chapter on "Park and Social Processes," which takes the place of a summarising chapter in the 1940 issue. Some few additions have been made to booklists, but otherwise the book is as before. The new chapter will make it necessary for libraries to order a copy, and undergraduate students at least will welcome the clear account of Park and his ideas, especially since Barnes omitted him from his new "Introduction to the History of Sociology."

*Principles of Criminology.* Revised edition. By Edwin H. Sutherland. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott, 1947. Pp. 643. \$4.50.

At least a quarter of this excellent text in criminology and penology has been rewritten and revised. Although many of the footnote references still bear witness to the fact that the book was first written in 1924, statistics are up to 1940, the bibliographies are modern, and so are many other references. The author's ideas on crime causation do not correspond with Catholic teaching and must be corrected and amplified for undergraduate students, but undoubtedly this text is one of the best in the field and will continue to be widely used in our colleges.

*So! You Want to Get Married!* By D. F. Grant. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. 131. \$2.50,

This small volume, written by a mother, is designed to give teen-agers not only some insight into the true meaning of Christian marriage, but also some very practical ideas about how to approach marriage in an adult fashion. Written in breezy style, the book fulfils its purpose, and will be a welcome addition to high school library shelves.

*The Art of Happy Marriage.* By Rev. J. A. Magner. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. ix 273. \$2.75.

In addition to giving the reader an idea of the meaning of Christian marriage, Father Magner provides practical advice for courtship days and married life, as well as rather minute details of etiquette for the marriage ceremony and its attendant folkways. Although written for older people than Mrs. Grant's work, the style makes for easy reading. The book has its place chiefly for the general reader, but it will be of value also as supplementary reading in our college courses on the ethics of marriage and family life.



*A Fire Was Lighted.* By Theodore Maynard. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1948 Pp. x 443. \$3.50.

This life of Hawthorne's daughter will be of interest to all students of American literature, to Catholics in general, to Catholic social workers, and to Catholic sociologists who like to see their studies of society translated into active public welfare. As one might expect, Maynard has provided a well-written and very interesting account of Rose Hawthorne Lathrop who, a convert to Catholicism, after an unhappy marriage, and when she was 45, began her great work for the suffering poor, which led to the establishment of a new American religious community: the Dominican Congregation of St. Rose of Lima, otherwise known as the Servants of Relief for Incurable Cancer.

*Basic Logic.* By R. A. McCall. New York: Barnes & Noble. Pp. x 193 \$2.00

A brief, one-semester presentation of formal logic, following the traditional pattern. Exercises are provided at the end.

*Medical Essentials for Students of the Professions Allied to Medicine.* By G. O. Broun. St. Louis, Mo.: St. Louis University, 1947. Pp. 158. \$2.

The author has presented a brief encyclopaedia of diseases and pathological conditions, their effect and something of their treatment, in handy mimeoprinted student notebook form, for social workers, nurses, dieticians, librarians and others. The book would also be valuable for all those who wish to inform themselves of some of the essential elements of the diseases to which man is prone.

*Temoinages sur nos Orphelinats Receuillis et commentes.* By A. Saint-Pierre. Montreal: Fides, 25 rue Saint-Jacques Est. 1947. Pp. 157. \$1.

The author sent a questionnaire to 738 former residents in Catholic orphanages, to which he received 142 replies. The questionnaire contained 31 questions which included the length of stay in the orphanage; education received; the impression received about the orphanage, food provided, attention during illness, changed conditions with changing superiors, books read, holidays provided; state of health on leaving the orphanage; how the orphan was fitted to meet normal social conditions in the outside world; did the stay in the orphanage hurt or help his later adjustment to life. The replies naturally varied, and while some blamed the orphanage for bad preparation for life, many showed no regret for the stay in the orphanage, others regretted the necessity for having to have lived there but thought the final outcome was not deleterious. The conclusions arrived at were: granted certain improvements in certain institutions, orphanages fill a needed role and are not harmful to the average child in the way some advocates for foster homes consider them.

PERIODICAL REVIEWS

C. J. NUESSE, Editor  
*The Catholic University of America*  
 Washington 17, D. C.

Recent articles with special pertinence for Catholic sociologists.

Boylan, M. Eugene, O.C.R., "The Priest,, Social Studies and Spirituality," *Christus Rex*, 1 (4): 46-55. October 1947.

The popes have directed that all priests should have knowledge of sound social principles and that some should have specialized training in appropriate fields of social science. Citing these papal directives and noting the particular circumstances requiring socially-informed priests in Ireland, the author presents a cogent statement of the relation of social studies to the spiritual life, largely summarized in this sentence: "A Christian social organization is at once the result of Christ's life in the members of society, and also a means to form Christ in them" (p. 54). When acting out of obedience and a true sense of fraternal charity, the priest does not endanger his spiritual life by social action but rather takes a direct path to union with Christ. The fruits of such action may not be immediately apparent, but in the long view we act as members of the Mystical Body, and "even in what one might call the natural order of super-natural activity" (p. 53), study of broad social issues may be the shortest way to a solution of local problems. With a crusade for a

Catholic social policy must go a crusade for a deep interior life among the laity as well as the clergy. This is the challenge to the Irish: "we are a nation of Catholics without any sufficiently large minority of non-Catholics to excuse us from the obligation of making our social structure conform to Christian principles" (p. 48).

Fitzgerald, William J., "The Idea of Democracy in Contemporary Catholicism," *The Review of Religion*, 12 (2): 148-65. January 1948.

This paper is included in a collection on "Religion and Democracy" originally presented to the Columbia University Seminar on Religion. It is expository in character, and altogether an excellent and objective analysis of the Pope's Christmas message of 1944 and of his addresses to the Rota in 1945 and 1946. In explanation of the apparent hostility or indifference of some nineteenth-century popes toward democracy, it is correctly noted that in the past on the continent of Europe, democracy has usually meant extreme liberalism and anticlericalism. Pius X is credited with developing the political and juridical aspects of the democratic concept—especially in his statement regarding freedom of opinion and expression as a distinguish-

ing mark—whereas Leo XIII and Pius XI had limited themselves for the most part to ethical and social considerations. Fundamental Catholic premises are well outlined: it is recognized that there is no isolated Catholic theory of the state, but a Catholic theory of society in which the state has a definite and limited place. The Church has lived under different regimes, insisting only on the protection of fundamental human rights. From the Christmas message the main points elaborated are the emphasis on the "common man," the juridical statement of freedom of opinion and expression, the distinction between the people and the masses which is at the foundation of representative parliamentary government, the necessity of authority rooted in the natural law (understood in its Catholic sense), the need for mental and moral maturity of the peoples, and the necessity for an organization of the peace. From the addresses to the Rota there are pronouncements on the distinction between the Church and the State, the fundamental rights of the person, the incompatibility of Catholicism and totalitarianism, the position of the Church regarding freedom of conscience and toleration, and the necessity that democracy be based upon Christian principles if it is to survive. Excerpts from the constitutions of Belgium, Brazil, and Ireland, and a bibliography are appended. Unfortunately, the Catholic position is not always so well understood or so objectively treated where it is mentioned in other articles in the issue.

Haas, Most Rev. Francis J., "Three Economic Needs of the 1880's and of the 1940's," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, 117 (6): 401-25. December 1947.

Three basic Catholic teachings on economic order may be found in the testimony before a Senate committee in 1883 of Peter J. McGuire, "the less than frequent Catholic" who was a labor leader of the late nineteenth century. First is the necessity of united action by employers to maintain wage levels and to promote the common good. Employers are presently organized through trade associations and the basing point system to maintain prices and thereby, in effect, to freeze real wages, with the resulting concentration of wealth and income disclosed in numerous available reports. A single employer acting alone cannot do what his conscience dictates in wage matters; employers must act together, and for this purpose the popes have proposed the system of organized industries and professions. Under such a system, employers and employees would be required to face each other in the presence of a representative of government, and thus think and act together. McGuire's second basic idea concerned the maintenance of adequate purchasing power in the hands of labor to assure general prosperity, and Bishop Haas cites some current economic facts to show that this need is still present (though the idea has acquired the label of "the underconsumption theory"). Finally, it is important that all should think more—and think more of others. Employers are charged with the duties of helping to build up the system of Industry Councils, abandoning monopolistic practices, and ensuring just wages. A sizeable number of lesser industrialists has appeared to support at least some of these proposals, as in the Committee for Economic Development. Unions must broaden their horizons, eliminate racketeering, ab-

andon restrictive practices, bargain fairly, unite to end the present organizational split, and get rid of Communism. All must note that three parties and not merely two have an interest in the solution of economic problems—employers, employees, and the public.

McAvoy, Thomas T., C.S.C., "The Formation of the Catholic Minority in the United States, 1820-1860", *The Review of Politics*, 10 (1): 13-24. January 1948.

American Catholics are united by the common bond of the Faith but ethnically and culturally they are exceedingly diverse. This interpretive study rests on the premise that "What there is of a distinctive Catholic culture is the result of the interaction between the doctrinal unity and this political, social and economic divergence" (p. 13). The basic structural form of the American Catholic body and its special culture are held to have been shaped during the waves of Irish Catholic immigration and the nativistic reaction of the years immediately preceding the Civil War. The comparatively few English-speaking Catholics before 1835 had a higher social position than has been assigned the Catholic group since that time, largely because they shared the dominant culture patterns and held to the "defeatist attitude" (p. 26) of their English forbearers in seeking acceptance on the basis of their cultural attainments alone. The immigrants changed the pattern, perhaps delaying educational and political progress, but bringing "the aggressive American Catholicism which manifests itself in public demonstrations, the frequentation of the sacraments, and the insistence on Catholic parochial schools" (pp. 32-33). Though early

outnumbered by the Irish, and later by other ethnic groups, the Anglo-American Catholics remained a principal leavening influence, assisting the transformation of "foreign" into "American" Catholics. In the eighteenth century this group easily absorbed the Irish, French, and Germans, so much so that the cultivated French members of the clergy and the hierarchy continued to identify themselves with the older Catholic group and became alarmed at the growth to dominance of the Irish, whom they considered quite as foreign as themselves. The Irish apparently could not understand that, if they spoke English, they were still divergent in culture, so they came into conflict not only with the French but with the native Catholics. The author explains, "Faced with American nativists who were hostile to their religion, the Catholic immigrants can be excused for not realizing that to prefer the ideals of the Anglo-American Catholics was perhaps a greater loyalty to Catholicism and certainly a better service to American Catholic culture" (p. 34). The Irish, when they had been partly assimilated and were dominant in ecclesiastical affairs, did not prove themselves any more sympathetic with other immigrants for having had similar experiences themselves. This is an important article for Catholic sociologists who, in cooperation with historians, ought to investigate the social structure of the Catholic body in more recent times.

Millet, John H., S. J., "The Catholic Action Rural Movement," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, 117 (5): 348-60. November 1947.

This article is descriptive, intended as a survey of the general rural movement within Catholic Action,

with indications of its applicability in the United States. Attention is given almost exclusively to the Australian and Canadian national movements, since these countries are deemed more nearly comparable to the United States than Belgium, France, Holland, or Switzerland. Both farm and nonfarm people are reached; in Canadian parishes farm youth and town youth are in the same cells, in Australia adult farmers and nonfarm rural adults form separate sections. In the latter country only adults are nationally organized, in contrast to the others where only youth cells are so widespread as to form a national organization. Using publications of these groups as sources, attention is called to the statements of the problems of rural youth and adult farmers, to the necessity and role of Catholic Action, and to the cell technique, the inquiry program, and the services offered. This article is relevant for study of Catholic Action as a social

movement, for rural sociology, and for the sociology of the parish.

Reynolds, John J., "Youth Hostels for Delinquent Boys," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, 117 (5): 361-68. November 1947.

A plea is made for placing certain types of delinquents in small "institutional homes," located in middle class residential districts where the community's educational, recreational, religious, and other resources may be utilized in the regular way and without additional cost. The staff—the crucial problem—would include a priest-director, a devoted lay woman to act as a kind of "house-mother," and an assistant with some training in social work. Professional social workers may consider that the standards of staff training proposed are too low, but the type of "home" suggested has undeniable advantages. Useful reading for the course in delinquency or social work.







---

## NEEDED: BACK COPIES

Our supply of the December 1946 (Volume VII, No. 4) and December 1942 (Volume III, No. 4) issues of the American Catholic Sociological Review has been exhausted. Libraries are asking us for copies to complete their library file.

May we ask our readers who do not plan to file permanently their back copies of the REVIEW that they forward us copies of these issues. Simply put the December 1946 or December 1942 issues in an envelope (the postage is three cents) with your name and return address. In the following mail we will send you seventy-five cents for the 1946 issue, fifty cents for the 1942 issue. No correspondence is necessary. It will be sufficient to send copies to

AMERICAN CATHOLIC SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

820 N. Michigan Ave.

CHICAGO 11, ILLINOIS

---

## Reprints from the American Catholic Sociological Review

The REVIEW has in stock a limited quantity of reprints of articles listed below. The price of each reprint is five cents, in coin or stamps. On all orders of less than twenty-five cents, please enclose a three cent postage stamp.

- (1) *Race Relations — As Seen by a Catholic.* Daniel M. Cantwell, December 1946. (Now back in stock.)
- (2) *Value-Judgments in Sociology.* Paul Hanly Furfey, June 1946.
- (3) *Books for a Sociology Library.* Edward A. Marciniak, June 1945.
- (4) *The Sociologist and Scientific Objectivity.* Paul Hanly Furfey, March 1945.
- (5) *The Rural People in the Postwar World.* O. E. Baker, March and June 1944.
- (6) *Tragic Dualism, Chaotic Syncretism, Quantitative Colossalism, and Diminishing Creativeness of Contemporary Sentate Culture.* Pitirim A. Sorokin, March 1941.
- (7) *Group Antagonisms and International Relations.* C. J. Nuesse, June 1947.
- (8) *Sociological Implications of UNESCO,* John D. Donovan, March 1947.
- (9) *Catholics in the 79th Congress.* Edward S. Dunn, S.J. December 1946.
- (10) *Public Health Insurance in the United States.* Edward A. Marciniak, October 1947. (Six cents.)
- (11) *Who's Who Among Catholic Sociologists.* Compiled by Clement S. Mihanovich, October 1946. (Twenty cents.)

